Metaphysics of the Absolute and Reference Points (MARP)

A New Vision of Cosmos and Existence

by

Laurent Theophile D'Artagnan

Copyright © 2026 Laurent Theophile D'Artagnan

Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Non-commercial sharing, citation, and adaptation are permitted, provided that appropriate credit is given to the author.

Independently published by the author.

Website: https://laurentdartagnan.com

Archival record: Zenodo

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18842209

Author and Academic Profiles

Laurent Theophile D'Artagnan

Official Website: https://laurentdartagnan.com

Contact Email: contact@laurentdartagnan.com

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0188-9712

Table of Contents

Introduction ..... [5]

1. **Layers of Existence ..... [13]**
2. **The Reference Point ..... [30]**

   How Does Difference Become Measurable?
3. **Identity ..... [43]**

   The Decision of Fixation and the Condition of Resumption
4. **Time ..... [54]**

   The Ordering of Resumption, Not an Independent Essence
5. **Memory ..... [67]**

   The Economic Preservation of Trace, Not a Mysterious "Storehouse"
6. **Causality ..... [86]**

   The Economy of Linkage, Not an Independent "Essential Law"
7. **Logic ..... [100]**

   The Locks of Resumption and Their Limits
8. **Truth and Error ..... [113]**

   Legitimacy as the Capacity for Resumption
9. **Consciousness ..... [127]**

   Advanced Measurement and the Flexibility of the Reference Point
10. **Meaning and Ethics ..... [142]**

Conclusion ..... [156]

Resumption as the Limit of Understanding

Appendices ..... [165]

Appendix A. Preliminary Symbolic Formulation of the Economy of Measurement and Legitimacy ..... [167]

Appendix B. Brief Applications: Quantum Theory / Artificial Intelligence / Experience ..... [177]

Appendix C. The Psychology of Attribution: Emotion, Desire, and Will ..... [187]

Appendix D. The Bridge and the Objections: From the Absolute to Attribution, and the Devil's Advocate ..... [198]

Appendix E. Brief Operational Examples (10 Examples) ..... [218]

Appendix F. Extended Application: Addiction as the Hijacking of Reference and the Contraction of the Economy of Measurement ..... [227]

Appendix G. Extended Application: Quantum Measurement as the Fixation of Reference, Not an Ontological Riddle ..... [249]

Selected References ..... [270]

Introduction

Methodological Lock: The Claim / Non-Claim Compact

MARP does not claim to describe the content of the world in itself. Rather, it specifies the conditions under which resumption is legitimate within any limited frame of measurement. At the same time, it neither denies the world's existence nor reduces it to an arbitrary construction. Instead, it shows that every reading of the world passes through an economy of measurement, and that its legitimacy is assessed by passage, stability, and revisability—not by any claim to transcendent correspondence.

This book does not presuppose agreed-upon metaphysical axioms, for the absence of agreement is itself part of the problem it addresses. Accordingly, it does not begin from a ready-made theory of content telling us what the world is. It begins, rather, from a minimal operational threshold that precedes the great disputes: **how does difference become readable at all? And how does understanding continue without collapsing into endless maintenance?**

Starting Point: No Readable Difference Without Attribution

The starting point is simple and decisive: differences are readable only through attribution. It makes no sense to say, "this is larger," or "truer," or "closer," or "before," without a frame of measurement within which we operate—whether sensation, instrument, or perceptual system—and a reference for measurement to which we appeal—whether criterion, context, or prior experience. There is, therefore, no such thing as measurement in a vacuum: measurement is the rendering of difference as readable within a frame.

But our frame is not absolute. It operates with limited resources: attention, memory, time, energy, and situational pressure. It therefore cannot carry all differences at once, nor can it grant final comprehensiveness with respect to what it measures. This limitation is not an accidental defect; it is a condition of operation. Without it, there would be no need for fixation, no economy of measurement, and no resumption.

Lock: In MARP, the Beginning Is Resumption, Not an Origin Point

In MARP, the beginning is not an origin point preceding existence, nor a first moment narrated as an event in a sequence. Before and after are themselves ordering devices internal to the level of attribution, while the Absolute is not narrated as a temporal path.

The beginning is an operational resumption: the fixation of a carrying difference as a reference point within a limited frame of measurement. Differences that can be carried are selected, while those that cannot yet be carried are deferred into retroactive trace. At that point, differentiation is transformed from liquidity into a track that can be followed.

This is why time will later be understood as an ordering of resumption rather than an independent substance, and why the question, "Where did everything begin?" is understood as a demand for a beginning outside every network of attribution—a demand that does not pass operationally.

The Traditional Impasse: Circularity or Unexamined Foundation

Here a recurrent philosophical impasse appears: if differences are readable only through attribution, can attribution itself be justified from outside attribution? In other words, can a final reference be established outside the whole of our experience in order to secure it?

Thought usually divides into two unsatisfying routes:

- either circularity: the frame is justified by the frame itself;

- or unexamined foundation: an external basis is posited without any legitimate criterion for establishing it, and the rest of the structure is suspended upon it.

This binary—circularity or unexamined foundation—is what turns much of metaphysics into irresolvable battles: between those who absolutize a transcendent ground, and those who deny any independent ground only to fall into another reductionism.

Accordingly, this book proposes a different way out. Rather than searching for a final attribution from outside, it reformulates the terrain of the question through a methodological distinction between two levels:

At the level of the **Absolute**, existence stands through differentiation: no specifier distributes differences, no ontological nothingness separates copies, and absolute identity is impossible.

At the level of **attribution**, reference points are fixed as a minimal degree of differentiation fit to serve as a reference for measurement. Because the frame of measurement is limited, an economy of measurement emerges, along with the limits of attribution—that is, the limits of resumption: identity, time, memory, causality, and logic—not as independent essences, but as functions required for understanding to pass, stabilize, and remain revisable.

Yet this distinction does not mean that there are two separate worlds, nor that the Absolute is a self-standing object to be handled in the same way as the objects of attribution. In MARP, the Absolute is neither a thing, nor a self, nor an independent object such that it could be inferred as one infers the objects of attribution; for inference itself operates within attribution and under its conditions. The Absolute is therefore not indicated as a positive cognitive content, but as a methodological limit of prohibition: it forbids the conversion of the conditions of reading into objects read in the same mode,

and forbids the projection of the tools of attribution—such as cause, time, measurement, and object—onto what is not their object in the first place.

Hence the distinction between the level of the Absolute and the level of attribution is not the positing of two separate worlds. It is an explanatory distinction imposed by the limitation of the frame. Some questions arise only within attribution, and some limits can be preserved only by refusing to confuse what is measured with that which makes measurement possible without itself being an object of measurement.

The legitimacy of this framework does not lie in claiming that a final truth has been found outside measurement. Its legitimacy lies in showing how understanding works when it is limited: when fixation succeeds, when it turns into a lock, when truth is legitimate as stability under revision, and when error results from a harsh economy or from underdetermination. In this way, the framework does not compete with theories over the content of the world; it explains the conditions under which any interpretation within the world coheres.

Lock: Knowledge Is Not Possession, but Resumption

In MARP, knowledge is not understood as something we possess or as a content we store. Every thing within attribution is an identity-fixation, while the frame of measurement is limited in capacity and cannot carry all differences at once. Knowledge therefore functions as retroactive trace reconstructed when needed.

Here, knowledge is not something owned, but a success in resumption: the capacity of a fixation to pass and remain stable before new differences without turning into escalating maintenance or a lock immunized against revision. Its criterion is not final correspondence, but operational legitimacy: **passage + stability + revisability**.

Thus the economy of measurement appears not as a stylistic choice, but as a necessity: because the frame of measurement is limited, what can be carried is selected for presence, while what cannot yet be carried is deferred into retroactive trace. The legitimacy of knowledge is therefore assessed by its capacity to resume within this economy without lock or escalating maintenance.

The Name of the Framework and Its Promise

We have given this framework the name: **Metaphysics of the Absolute and Reference Points (MARP).**

Its promise to the reader is clear: to recalibrate the foundations of understanding without demolishing what succeeds, but by distinguishing its conditions and its limits, and by providing an operational language that moves the great questions beyond the binary of circularity / unexamined foundation into a path that can be tested, revised, and resumed.

Brief Positioning

A reader may approach MARP through familiar families of thought: pragmatism, Kantianism, and phenomenology / hermeneutics. Functionally, it shares three features with them:

- the refusal to treat knowledge as final possession;
- the recognition that the conditions of reading are part of what we call truth within attribution;
- concern with what passes and stabilizes rather than with forms of transcendent correspondence.

Yet it differs from them in two decisive respects:

- it does not turn conditions into a transcendental subject or into a closed language. Rather, it always binds them to the limitation of the frame of measurement and to the economy of measurement as an operational constraint;
- it treats the Absolute as a limit of prohibition rather than as metaphysical content: what must be denied so that we do not slip into a specifier, an ontological nothingness, or an absolute identity that cancels copies.

Thus MARP is not another school concerning the content of the world. It is a framework of legitimacy that explains why some methods resemble one another in their results, and when they turn into a lock or into liquidity.

MARP's Realism (in the Operational Sense)

Realism here is not access to an essence outside attribution, but acknowledgment of an irreducible differentiation, and of constraints that do not permit just any interpretation to pass. What neither passes nor stabilizes cannot be rescued by will or convention.

Protocol of Use (Four Steps)

Because MARP is presented not merely as a descriptive thesis, but as a usable framework, its procedural method can be summarized in the following steps:

1. Identify the frame of measurement and the reference for measurement.
2. Identify the economy of measurement (**E1–E4**) and the present pressure.
3. Identify which limits of attribution are being invoked: identity, time, memory, causality, logic.
4. Test legitimacy:
    - Does the fixation pass?
    - Does it stabilize?
    - Does it accept revision?
    - Does it reduce maintenance and protect carrying differences?

Summary of the Introduction

This book does not begin from ready-made metaphysical axioms, but from an operational question: **how does difference become readable, and how does understanding continue?**

Differences are readable only through attribution: there is no measurement without a frame of measurement and a reference for measurement. Since our frame is limited in resources, an economy of measurement emerges, and with it the necessity of fixation and resumption.

Limitation in MARP does not imply ontological isolation or an island in the midst of nothingness. It means that the frame of measurement cannot carry all differences at once, and so is forced into an operational solution: **present selection + later return**. What cannot be carried now does not become emptiness; it is compressed into an economic trace and reintegrated upon return. In this way, limitation becomes a motor of connectedness rather than a cause of separation.

Here the impasse of traditional thought appears: either circularity, or an unexamined external foundation. MARP's way out rests on a methodological distinction between the Absolute as differentiation without specifier and without ontological nothingness, and attribution as a level of fixation, measurement, and resumption.

The framework therefore does not explain the content of the world as such. Rather, it explains the conditions under which interpretation within the world coheres.

Glossary of the Introduction

The Absolute: a limiting name for the condition of possibility; it is not measured, not tested, and not narrated as a temporal path.

Attribution: the process / level that renders difference readable.

Reference Point: a minimal differentiation fixed as a reference for measurement.

Frame of Measurement: the carrier / medium within which measurement occurs (sense / instrument / system).

Reference for Measurement: the criterion / context to which we appeal in judgment.

Economy of Measurement: the regulation / reduction of differences due to limited resources.

Carrying Differences: differences such that, if neglected, they break resumption or prevent upgrading; and if carried, they open a path and enrich precision without escalating maintenance.

Beginning: a point of resumption within a network of attribution; not a first moment in the Absolute.

Limits of Attribution: functions invoked to secure passage: identity, time, memory, causality, logic.

Circularity / Unexamined Foundation: the impasse of justifying the frame.

Chapter One

Layers of Existence

1.0 Introduction: Why Do We Need a Layered Map?

At its most basic level, traditional philosophy turns on an unexamined binary: either existence is taken to stand in itself, or it is taken to stand through something other than itself—representation, mind, language, relation, or condition. Yet in either direction, a prior question remains unresolved: what makes standing possible without collapsing into an explanatory void?

If one says that existence stands in itself, the self that grounds it still demands specification. If one says that it stands through another, the ground of that other must also be explained. The dispute therefore returns to an endless regress of foundation.

MARP does not enter this binary as a third option competing with the first two. It reformulates the question at its root. At the level of the Absolute, existence is neither a standing thing awaiting a carrier nor a standing relation awaiting its terms. It is standing-through-differentiation.

At the level of attribution, by contrast, reference points are fixed so that differences become measurable. From this there arise the limits of attribution—identity, time, memory, causality, and logic—not as independent essences, but as functions required for the resumption of measurement within a limited frame of measurement. Consciousness, in turn, appears as an advanced case of measurement within this same operation.

1.1 How Should This Map Be Read?

What follows is neither a hierarchy of value nor a scale of superiority in the Absolute. It is an explanatory sequence showing how we move from:

- the condition of existence,
- to the conditions of measurement,
- and then to the limits of attribution that appear in experience.

1.2 A Layered Map of Existence in MARP

A Concentrated Overview

The Level of the Absolute

Existence stands through differentiation: no specifier distributes differences, and no ontological nothingness separates differentiated copies.

The Level of Attribution

Reference points are fixed as a minimal degree of differentiation fit to serve as a reference for measurement.

The Limits of Attribution

Because the frame of measurement is limited, an economy of measurement appears, and the limits are invoked: identity, time, memory, causality, and logic.

Consciousness

An advanced frame of measurement that reaches a high degree of flexibility and organization, enabling the management of multiple differences without collapse.

1.3 First: The Level of the Absolute

Existence Stands Through Differentiation

1.3.1 Introduction

If philosophy oscillates between “standing in itself” and “standing through another,” MARP begins from a prior formulation: existence stands through differentiation.

This does not mean that MARP introduces a “thing” called differentiation as a new essence. Rather, it states the point more precisely: difference is not a secondary event, nor the result of an external specifier distributing properties over a silent void. It is the very condition of standing. To speak of existence without difference is to speak without content, since every determination is the determination of some difference.

1.3.2 Two Foundational Locks

1.3.2.1 The First Lock: No Specifier in the Absolute

Every specifier imagined as standing outside differentiation in order to impose or distribute it immediately returns us to a stronger question: what specifies the specifier?

Accordingly, MARP does not search for an “agent above existence,” nor for a “carrier preceding manifestation.” It affirms instead that differentiation in the Absolute requires no mediating term to authorize it. Differentiation is what makes any “thing” capable of being called a thing in the first place.

1.3.2.2 The Second Lock: No Ontological Nothingness Separates Differentiated Instances

If real gaps of nothingness were posited between copies or states, we would need an account of how passage from nonbeing to being could occur, and of how variation could

continue without dissolving into isolated islands. In MARP, however, differentiation does not imply isolation: non-identical copies are not separated by ontological barriers, and difference requires no void in order to stand as difference.

1.3.3 The Collapse of Nothingness as an Ontological Possibility

If absolute identity is impossible, then "nothingness" can no longer remain a possibility in the ontological sense. For the possibility of nothingness assumes that existence could reverse into non-differentiation. But in MARP, existence stands through differentiation, and differentiation is the condition of standing itself.

Thus what we call "nothing" appears only within the level of attribution as:

- a gap in measurement,
- an absence of information,
- or a break in determination.

At the level of the Absolute, however, there is no ontological void into which copies are cast or erased.

Section Lock:

In 1.3 we do not yet establish how differences are read within experience. We establish only that the origin of existence is neither an essence awaiting specification nor a relation awaiting its terms, but standing-through-differentiation without specifier and without ontological nothingness.

1.4 The Impossibility of Absolute Identity

What Follows from Existence Standing Through Differentiation?

1.4.1 No Reference in the Absolute

There is no reference point in the Absolute against which differences are measured, because measurement is a function invoked only within the level of attribution. Differentiation in the Absolute is therefore not a matter of "measured differences," but of a more primitive mode of standing: differentiation that requires no prior reference in order to be affirmed.

1.4.2 The Meaning of Impossibility

The impossibility of absolute identity does not deny resemblance or operational stability within experience. It states a more precise claim:

It is impossible for two copies to count as "two" and at the same time be required to exhibit a total absence of difference.

"Two without difference" are not two in the Absolute. What has no difference cannot be established as multiplicity, and what is established as multiplicity cannot be altogether without difference.

1.4.3 Experience: Resumption, Not the Retrieval of Identity

Experience is not the recovery of a past copy "as such." It is the reading of differentiation once the conditions of attribution enter and begin to operate under an economy of measurement.

Example: the daily coffee ritual

"The same coffee" is not ontological identity, but an operational identity produced by the economy of measurement through the neglect of fine differences that make no decisive

difference in context. If the cost of error rises—sugar versus salt, for example—the economy collapses, and the frame returns to inspect its reference points.

Example: the mirror and the judgment "This is me"

Recognition is not testimony to the absence of change, but a functional success in integrating non-identical copies under one heading. Under severe swelling or abrupt change, the economy fails and identity collapses: "Who is this?"

1.4.4 Reality and the Self: Why Does the World Not Appear Discontinuous?

Non-identity in the Absolute does not imply separation. The difference between copies does not require gaps of nothingness between them.

By contrast, the coherence of the world and the self is an operational construction within attribution:

- identity,
- ordering (time),
- economic linkage (causality),
- preservation of trace (memory),
- and a lock of consistency (logic).

Example: live video versus frames

Non-identical frames are lived as continuity because the conditions of attribution order, preserve, and connect them. Ruptures appear when these conditions fail, not because the Absolute itself has changed.

Example: animation

Movement appears without any "real movement" within a single image. The continuity of experience results from economic integration, ordering, and preserved trace. If the ordering is disturbed, discontinuity appears at once.

1.4.5 Why Is Retrieval Not Identity?

Retrieval is a passage between non-identical copies, but it is governed by acts of fixation. What recurs is not an identical copy, but a pattern re-read under one operational identity.

1.4.6 Summary of the Impossibility of Absolute Identity

The impossibility of absolute identity is not a threat to experience; it is what explains it:

- In the Absolute: differentiation without reference.
- In attribution: experience as the economic resumption of reading that differentiation.

1.5 An Illustrative Analogy: The Absolute and Attribution

Take the example of numbers: a unique multiplicity that does not repeat itself (differentiation), then read through relations—greater/smaller/ratios—so that a network appears within which differences become measurable, retrievable, and comparable.

This example is analogical, not literal. The point is that attribution is not an ontological addition over the Absolute, but an operational image of differentiation once it enters a relation of reference.

1.6 Lock and Bridge to the Level of Attribution

Existence is not a neutral stage, nor a ball thrown outside the game. The appeal to an "outside" that explains the inside immediately reintroduces the specifier and, with it, the fantasy of ontological emptiness. If existence stands through differentiation, then whatever later appears as agent, object, or law must be understood as a fixation within

attribution: a way of organizing the reading of differentiation under an economy of measurement.

This does not mean that the Absolute is itself an object standing behind attribution. In MARP, the Absolute is neither a thing nor a self from which one could infer a hidden substrate, because inference is already an attributive tool. The Absolute is therefore introduced not as an object of knowledge, but as a methodological limit that forbids the projection of attributive tools onto what is not their proper object.

Non-enclosure, on this view, is not an accidental weakness that stronger instruments might one day overcome. It is structural. The Absolute is not a hidden object awaiting capture, nor a distant content that remains unknown only because the frame is still weak. It is not an object of measurement at all.

For that reason, measurement cannot be understood as a movement toward total enclosure. Every act of measurement requires fixation, and every fixation requires selection. A limited frame cannot carry all differences at once. Some differences become carrying differences, while others are deferred into trace and returned to later under new conditions of resumption. Non-enclosure is therefore not a defect added from outside; it is one of the conditions under which knowledge becomes possible.

What is not carried now does not become emptiness. It is compressed into economic trace and reintegrated upon return. Limitation thus becomes a motor of connectedness rather than a cause of separation. If a frame could carry all differences at once, there would be no economy of measurement, no resumption, no fixation, and no path of comparison. The fantasy of total presence would abolish the very structure through which understanding operates.

MARP therefore avoids two classical errors at once. It does not say that the Absolute is merely distant and might one day be enclosed by better tools. Nor does it say that what is not enclosed is nothing. It says, more precisely, that the Absolute is not a measurable object, and that non-enclosure is a structural condition of attribution itself.

For the same reason, the distinction between the Absolute and attribution is not an ontological dualism dividing two independent worlds. It is a methodological necessity. The Absolute is not an object standing over against attribution, and attribution is not a second realm added to existence. Attribution is the operational form in which differentiation becomes readable once it enters conditions of reference, comparison, and return. The distinction marks not a split in reality, but two aspects of one structure: what does not present itself as a final object of measurement, and what can be resumed through trace within a limited frame.

Attributive limitation should therefore not be understood as an accidental defect, or as a merely human weakness that a stronger instrument could in principle overcome. It is the operational expression of a deeper ontological structure. If existence stood through absolute identity, knowledge could be imagined as the full presence of the thing to itself. But existence in MARP does not stand in that way. It continues through ontological continuity, and knowledge can therefore function only as resumption through trace, not as possession of final presence. What becomes impossible here is not knowledge as such, but the fantasy of complete presence.

Ontological continuity is thus not the opposite of attributive limitation, but its condition of possibility. If there were an absolute break, trace, return, and comparison would all collapse. Because differentiation continues without ontological nothingness, reading remains possible—not as a return to an identical copy, but as a return to a carrier that permits renewed examination under limited conditions. What preserves the possibility of

truth is therefore not the stillness of a fixed essence, but the continuity of a carrier that allows distinction, linkage, and revision.

On this basis, doubt does not precede distinction; it presupposes it. Every act of doubt requires a difference between what is reviewed and that by which the review is carried out. It requires a trace to which one can return and a frame within which comparison can occur. Doubt cannot therefore dissolve distinction at the level of principle, because it operates only from within it. The point is not to recover a Cartesian certainty of the self, but to show that what cannot be bypassed operationally is not the "I," but differentiation itself: difference, trace, and the possibility of return. Presence in MARP is therefore not the presence of a self-identical essence, but of readable difference and of a continuity that makes resumption possible without ever becoming absolute identity.

The question therefore moves forward naturally: how does differentiation become measurable and resumable within limited experience?

1.7 Second: The Level of Attribution

How Does Differentiation Become Measurable?

At the level of the Absolute, differentiation stands without reference. But once differentiation is read within a limited frame, measurement becomes possible only through fixation. Attribution is the operational layer in which this fixation occurs. It does not add a second reality to existence; rather, it renders differentiation readable by binding some differences to points of reference under limited conditions.

1.7.1 Defining the Reference Point

Measurement does not occur merely because there is difference. Difference must first become referentially usable. This requires the fixation of a minimal degree of

differentiation capable of serving as a reference within a given context. This minimal degree is the reference point.

A reference point is not necessarily a thing. It may be an entity, a property, a criterion, a medium, or a mnemonic comparison. What matters is not its substance, but its function: it must be fixed enough for other differences to be read relative to it. In this sense, the reference point is not an ontological primitive added to existence, but an operational decision within attribution that allows measurement to begin.

1.7.2 The Triad of Measurement

Once a reference point is fixed, measurement proceeds within a minimal triad:

- **Frame of measurement:** the carrier or medium within which measurement occurs.
- **Reference for measurement:** that against which something is measured in context.
- **The measured:** what is actually subjected to measurement.

This triad should not be read as three independent things laid side by side. It names three functions required for any act of measurement to occur without collapse. The frame carries the operation, the reference stabilizes comparison, and the measured is what enters determination through that comparison. Without this triad, differentiation would remain unread—not because it is absent, but because no operational structure would yet have been fixed for its reading.

1.7.3 A Bridge to the Limits of Attribution

Because the frame of measurement is limited, and because no fixation can carry all differences at once, attribution cannot exhaust what it reads in a single act. Some differences are fixed now, while others are deferred, neglected, or left open to later

completion. This is not an epistemic failure superadded to an otherwise complete access; it is the very condition under which measurement proceeds at all.

For this reason, limitation in MARP is not a property of the Absolute, nor a contingent weakness imposed upon existence from outside. It appears only within attribution, once differentiation enters a limited frame that cannot carry every difference simultaneously. Selection, fixation, and deferment therefore arise as operational conditions of measurement, not as defects demanding a deeper cause.

This limitation creates neither isolation nor a void between what has been carried and what has not. It establishes, rather, an economy in which some differences become available now, while others are deferred to later completion through trace and return. A preliminary diagnosis, for example, is formed from a limited sample; later results may reorder what counted as before and after, revise causal linkage, and alter the original judgment. What occurs here is not separation from reality, but the self-revision of measurement through resumption.

Accordingly, the question is not "Why is there limitation?" as though limitation required a prior external decision or a first cause before attribution. That question would project the tools of attribution onto what precedes attribution itself. The more precise question is: what does the limitation of the frame require so that understanding does not collapse?

At exactly this point, the limits of attribution appear: identity as fixation, time as the ordering of resumption, memory as selective preservation, causality as economic linkage, and logic as a lock of consistency.

1.8 Third: The Limits of Attribution

Why Do Identity, Time, Memory, Causality, and Logic Appear?

Once differentiation is read through fixed reference points within a limited frame, measurement can no longer proceed as though everything were equally available at once. The frame must stabilize, order, preserve, connect, and regulate what it carries so that reading does not collapse under the weight of undifferentiated complexity. The limits of attribution name these necessary functions. They are not additions to the world, nor hidden essences waiting behind experience. They are the operational forms through which measurement remains possible under limitation.

1.8.1 Identity

Identity is the act of fixation by which measurement prevents collapse into total novelty. Without some decision that "this counts again as the same," comparison could not proceed, continuity could not be maintained, and every appearance would dissolve into unmanageable singularity. Identity in MARP is therefore not the discovery of an eternal self-same essence, but an operational stabilization that allows resumption to occur.

1.8.2 Time

Time is the codification of the order of resumption. It marks before and after, continuity and interruption, sequence and return. It is not a substance through which events travel, nor a container existing independently of measurement. It is the organizational form required when a limited frame must arrange what it cannot hold all at once.

1.8.3 Memory

Memory is the selective preservation of what suffices for resumption. Because the frame cannot retain every difference equally, some traces are carried forward while others are neglected. Memory is therefore not the storage of a complete past, but the preservation of enough trace to make renewed reading possible without overloading capacity.

1.8.4 Causality

Causality is the economic linkage of differences so that action, expectation, and revision

can proceed without paralysis. It does not name a hidden chain imposed from outside experience, but a way in which measurement reduces complexity by linking what matters for passage and anticipation. Causal order is thus not a view from above the world, but an operational strategy within limited attribution.

1.8.5 Logic

Logic is the lock of consistency that prevents operational contradiction from dissolving the possibility of inference. It secures the passage from one determination to another by regulating what may and may not stand together within the same act of reading. In MARP, logic is not projected onto the Absolute as though it governed existence from outside; it appears within attribution as a condition for coherent continuation under limitation.

Section Lock:

The limits of attribution do not explain the content of the world from above. They explain how understanding avoids collapse while attempting to read differentiation through a limited frame. Identity fixes, time orders, memory preserves, causality links, and logic secures consistency. Together they form the operational architecture by which attribution remains possible at all.

1.9 Fourth: Consciousness

Consciousness is not an independent essence added to the limits of attribution, nor a separate substance inserted into the operation from outside. It is an advanced threshold within attribution itself. It appears when the frame of measurement reaches a degree of flexibility and organization sufficient to manage multiple differences—including differences within the carrier itself—without losing the possibility of resumption.

In this sense, consciousness should not be treated as a metaphysical exception to the general architecture already established. The same operational conditions that make attribution possible at all—fixation, ordering, preservation, linkage, and consistency—also make possible a more complex form of measurement in which the frame does not merely register external differences, but can also re-enter its own operations, revise its own selections, and sustain a more dynamic relation between trace and interpretation.

What distinguishes consciousness, then, is not that it escapes limitation, but that it manages limitation at a higher degree of complexity. A conscious frame can hold together a wider range of differences, suspend immediate collapse, revise its own readings, and coordinate multiple layers of attribution without disintegration. It does not overcome the economy of measurement; it intensifies it, refines it, and renders it more flexible.

For this reason, consciousness should not be understood as something added after identity, time, memory, causality, and logic have already done their work. It is a more advanced operational configuration of these very limits once the frame becomes capable of greater internal organization and recursive adjustment. What appears here is not a second order of being, but a higher-order stabilization within the same attributive field.

This will be developed in detail in Chapter Nine.

1.10 Summary of the Foundational Chapter

This chapter has established the basic architecture of MARP. At the level of the Absolute, existence stands through differentiation, without specifier and without ontological nothingness. At the level of attribution, differentiation becomes readable only through

the fixation of reference points within a limited frame of measurement. The distinction between these two levels is not a division between independent worlds, but a methodological necessity imposed by the fact that existence does not present itself as a final object of measurement.

From this limited frame there arises an economy of measurement. Because no frame can carry all differences at once, attribution proceeds through selection, fixation, deferment, trace, and return. The limits of attribution therefore appear not as separate essences added to experience, but as the operational forms required for reading to continue without collapse: identity fixes, time orders, memory preserves, causality links, and logic secures consistency.

Within this same architecture, consciousness appears not as an external addition or metaphysical exception, but as an advanced threshold of attribution in which the frame reaches a higher degree of flexibility, internal organization, and revisability. The result is a layered map of existence in which the Absolute is not measured, attribution is the site of measurement, and the limits of attribution are the conditions under which measurement remains possible at all.

1.11 Transition to the Next Chapter

Having established the layered architecture of existence, the next step is to examine the practical core of attribution itself: the reference point. For if attribution is the operational layer in which differentiation becomes readable, the first question is how anything comes to function as a reference in the first place.

The following chapter therefore turns from the general map to its first concrete mechanism. It begins with the reference point as the minimal degree of differentiation

that can be fixed for measurement, and then clarifies how reference points vary, how measurement proceeds through them, and how this leads to the economy of measurement and its degrees (E4–E1). The transition from Chapter One to Chapter Two is therefore not a departure from the foundation, but its first detailed unfolding.

Appendix (1-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter One

The Absolute: standing-through-differentiation, without specifier and without ontological nothingness.

Attribution: the operational layer that renders difference readable by fixing reference points.

Reference Point: a minimal differentiation fixed referentially for measurement.

Frame of Measurement: the carrier or medium within which measurement occurs, and which is limited in capacity.

Reference for Measurement: the criterion or property by which we measure in context.

Limits of Attribution: identity, time, memory, causality, and logic as instruments of passage and resumption.

Economy of Measurement: the selection and reduction of differences due to the limitation of the frame of measurement.

Consciousness: an advanced frame of measurement that organizes the differences of content and carrier without collapse.

Chapter Two

The Reference Point

How Does Difference Become Measurable?

2.0 Introduction: Chess as "Referential Fixation"

At the beginning of a chess game, the pieces stand in a fixed arrangement, and White appears to have many possible moves available. But the moment the first move is played—say, **e4**—it becomes a reference point that reorganizes the entire field. This move may be a famous standard choice, a matter of stylistic preference, or even an arbitrary decision; what matters is that it has now become the adopted determination.

Once **e4** is fixed, the meaning of the remaining moves changes. Black's response is no longer a general question, but one constrained by this beginning (**e5, c5, or e6**...). White's subsequent plans then take shape in relation to the chosen reply. Even the character of the game becomes colored: **e4** tends toward open or semi-open games, unlike **d4** or other openings.

This example clarifies the chapter's central idea: difference does not become measurable merely by existing. Rather, once enough of it is fixed so as to function as a reference, the remaining differences are reread through it. This is the meaning of the reference point.

2.1 What Is a Reference Point?

A reference point is the minimal differentiation fixed referentially so that difference becomes measurable.

It is not necessarily a specific thing. It may be:

- an entity,
- a property,
- a criterion,
- a primary event,
- or a prior mnemonic comparison.

What matters is not its substance, but its function: it gives the frame of measurement a place from which reading begins, so that differences do not remain scattered without determination.

Thus, it is not enough that many differences exist in the world. Without a reference point, those differences remain an abundance without a track. But once a minimal degree of them is fixed, the entire field is reorganized around that fixation:

- What is measured?
- Relative to what is it measured?
- What is provisionally neglected so that measurement may proceed?

In this sense, the reference point is not a metaphysical origin, but an operational decision of fixation.

2.2 The Triad of Measurement

Every measurement operates within a triad without which it cannot stand:

- **Frame of measurement:** the carrier or medium within which measurement occurs.
- **Reference for measurement:** the criterion or property to which we appeal in judgment.
- **The measured:** what is actually subjected to measurement.

So if we say, “This thing is heavier than that one,” we presuppose:

- a frame within which the measurement occurs,
- a reference to which we appeal,
- and a measured object upon which the judgment is imposed.

Measurement thus ceases to be a mysterious act; it becomes an organized relation between:

carrier + criterion + measured object

2.3 An Applied Example of the Economy of Measurement: The Forest and the Branch

Imagine two people walking through a forest. They hear a sudden sound, and a nearby branch moves.

The first—under the pressure of danger—immediately reads the scene as: **predator / run**.

The second—in a calmer state, or after capacity has widened—notes that the branch moved because the wind passed at a certain angle, and that the sound came from two trees rubbing against each other.

The thing itself did not change. What changed was the price of measurement paid by the frame.

The first purchased a quick, low-cost reading for the sake of survival. The second purchased a higher-cost reading for the sake of understanding.

Here the economy of measurement appears clearly:

- under pressure, differences are reduced to the minimum required for passage;
- as capacity widens, more differences can be carried, reduction can be softened, and precision can be increased.

Thus, we do not see the world "as it is" outside measurement, but as the capacity of the frame permits under an economy of measurement.

Example: white noise and the illusion of silence

You hear static between two stations and say, "There is nothing here." But often this is not nothingness; it is a fullness of signals that the device cannot isolate into a single resumable pattern. "Nothing" here is a judgment issued by attribution when it fails to fix one pattern fit for resumption.

Lock of the example:

What appears as emptiness is often an existential surplus beyond the capacity of isolation, not ontological nothingness.

And what appears here in the form of a quick reading or a broader reading will appear in the next section in more precise form: probability itself is not a property in the world, but an effect of underdetermination within attribution.

2.4 Probability as an Economy of Determination

Not a "Basket of Options" in the Absolute

2.4.1 Introduction

Just as Chapter One established the collapse of nothingness as an ontological possibility, this chapter establishes a parallel step: probability is not an ontological fact in the Absolute, nor a self-standing space.

What we call probability is the effect of underdetermination within a limited frame: a map of expectation constructed under an economy of measurement, one that may collapse entirely if the frame of determination itself is deficient.

2.4.2 Probability = The Hesitation of the Frame, Not the Hesitation of the World

When we say, "This or that may happen," we are not describing a world hesitating among possibilities that exist in themselves. We are describing a frame that does not yet possess enough determination.

Hence:

- probability is not a property of the Absolute,
- but the name of the degree of our disclosure within attribution.

2.4.3 Possibility and Impossibility: Attributive Limits, Not Absolute Facts

In the Absolute there is no probability as an entity divided into possible and impossible. This division appears only within the level of attribution:

- we judge something possible because our data do not exclude it,
- and we judge something impossible because our data do exclude it.

But this reveals the limits of the framework and the data more than it reveals the essence of reality.

In MARP's terms, possibility and impossibility are tests of the stability of expectation under an economy of measurement. The more capacity widens and the more precise the frame becomes, the narrower the zone of looseness becomes; the narrower the capacity, the more the possible expands and the more unstable the boundary becomes.

2.4.4 Lock: The Metaphysical Question as an Effect of Attribution

In MARP, the question, "Why is there something rather than nothing?" is not read as a direct gateway to a first cause, but as an effect of a limited frame that generates gaps and seeks a fixation that reduces the cost of the indeterminate.

It therefore does not apply to the Absolute, because something and nothing are themselves concepts that appear only within attribution.

What is called a final metaphysical answer may be nothing more than a compensatory explanation that succeeded locally in closing the gap. In this sense, the analysis does not move from the world to what lies above the world, but from the question itself to the conditions that make its appearance possible and its fixation legitimate.

Example: from survival to the sacred story

A group may infer that its survival results from cooperation and accumulated shared

experience, and this is a revisable operational fixation. But under pressure, that fixation may harden into a closed story: “we are chosen,” or “a higher power protects us.” In that case, the confusion lies not in noticing the stability itself, but in transferring it from the level of operational success to the level of a metaphysical claim that no longer accepts revision.

Here the difference appears between:

- a living interpretation that remains revisable,
- and a closed compensatory explanation that grants reassurance but raises maintenance.

2.4.5 Example: The Tunnel Train and the Illusion of the Space of Probabilities

You stand outside the tunnel and say: the train will emerge from track **A** or **B**. But inside the tunnel there is no train “between two tracks”; the switch is in a determinate position. The other probability was a gap in attribution. And if a rock falls and destroys the train, it will emerge from neither **A** nor **B**, and the whole basket collapses.

Lock of the example:

Probability does not describe the world’s hesitation; it describes the frame’s hesitation when it lacks enough determination.

2.4.6 Example: Coin Tossing and the Collapse of the “Basket of Probabilities”

We reduce the outcome to **heads / tails**. But if the coin rolls into a deep crack, or a bird picks it up, one of the probabilities does not merely fail to actualize; the entire basket may collapse, because heads and tails were not ontological possibilities offered by the world, but expectations built on the omission of differences that had not been entered into the calculation.

Likewise, when we assign probabilities to a person's location—**here / there / arrived / did not arrive**—this does not mean that one of these probabilities must be realized. All of them may be wrong, because they were built on incomplete data or on a narrow frame of determination.

Thus, in MARP, probability is an organization of partial ignorance within attribution, not an ontological description of options floating in reality.

2.5 The Spectrum of the Economy of Measurement (E4–E1)

2.5.1 An Interpretive Reading of the Spectrum

The rule of consistency here is clear:

- **E4 = highest reduction / highest pressure**
- **E1 = highest capacity / least reduction**

2.5.2 E4 — Acute Economy

Economy of Emergency / Extreme Binary

Either safety or danger. Severe reduction of differences.

Example: panic or terror.

2.5.3 E3 — Template Economy

Economy of Templates / Typical Binary

Thinking in ready-made templates and fixed categories: **with us / against us, useful / harmful**.

It passes the decision quickly, but raises the risk of bias and lock.

2.5.4 E2 — Balanced Economy

Balanced Economy / Complex

Multiple axes with relative flexibility.

Example: a human being in a normal calm state, balancing more than one consideration without collapse.

2.5.5 E1 — Advanced Economy

Highly Structured, High-Capacity Economy / Advanced

Deep analytical awareness, deferred integration, redistribution of references rather than immediate fixation.

Example: a researcher or philosopher engaged in calm analysis.

2.6 Non-Human Examples of the Economy of Measurement

These examples are not presented as biology or neuroscience, but as operational applications of one idea: every limited system is compelled to select certain differences and carry or reduce them according to an economy of measurement that allows passage and resumption.

2.6.1 E4 — Threshold / Emergency Economy

The gazelle and predation: under immediate danger, measurement collapses into a sharp binary: **danger / no danger, flee / do not flee**. Differences are reduced to a single decisive signal that allows immediate survival.

2.6.2 E3 — Template Economy

The dog and the sound of keys: the sound is read through a ready-made template: "the owner is returning," without analyzing all possible alternatives. This is an economic reduction that often succeeds and sometimes fails, and its failure appears as a need for maintenance.

2.6.3 E2 — Balanced Economy

Chimpanzee and boxes: the frame widens to include several axes: the height of the goal, the stability of the box, and the order of movement. Revision appears here as part of measurement itself: trial, then adjustment, then another attempt.

2.6.4 E1 — Advanced Economy

Indicators of the inclusion of the carrier in measurement: in some advanced organisms, behavior may appear that suggests a mode of measurement that includes the differences of the carrier itself—body, criterion, and limits—something approximating consciousness in the operational sense of the framework.

2.6.5 Plants: Measurement Without a Nervous System

Sunflower: fixation of one decisive difference—the direction of the strongest light—followed by growth toward it.

Sundew: it does not respond to a single touch, but gathers repeated touches within a temporal window in order to reduce error in response. This is a finer economy that lowers maintenance.

2.6.6 Machines and Artificial Intelligence: Programmed Measurement

Thermostat: an on/off threshold.

A simple word filter: classification through ready-made templates according to a list of words, with periodic maintenance of the list.

A recommendation system: balancing multiple axes, with the ability to modify behavior according to feedback.

A system that states its limits: the inclusion of the limits of its own frame within the response—an approximation to a more advanced economy.

2.6.7 Ecological Systems: Evolutionary Measurement Across Generations

Natural selection: traits pass and stabilize across copies because they reduce the cost of survival; traits that raise maintenance are excluded.

Applied summary:

The economy of measurement is not exclusive to humans. It is a general way of dealing with limited reference through:

- fixing reference points,
- selecting carrying differences,
- and doing so at varying degrees of reduction and revision.

2.7 Summary of the Chapter

The reference point is the minimal differentiation that can be fixed so that difference becomes measurable. Measurement always operates within a triad:

- frame of measurement,
- reference for measurement,
- and the measured.

Because the frame of measurement is limited, the spectrum of the economy of measurement (**E4–E1**) appears, and maps of expectation emerge:

- probability,
- possibility,
- impossibility,

not as facts in the Absolute, but as effects of underdetermination within attribution.

Measurement thus ceases to be a direct description of a world simply given in advance "as it is," and becomes instead an organization of differences under the limits of the frame.

2.8 Transition to the Next Chapter

Having established the reference point, the triad of measurement, and the spectrum of the economy of measurement, we now move to identity as the first limit required for resumption within the level of attribution:

How can we say of something that it is itself across non-identical copies?
And how can measurement proceed at all if no identity is fixed strongly enough to allow return and comparison?

Appendix (2-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Two

Reference Point: a minimal differentiation fixed referentially for measurement.

Frame of Measurement: the carrier or medium within which measurement occurs.

Reference for Measurement: the criterion or property by which we measure in context.

The Measured: the object to which measurement is actually applied.

Operational Triad: frame of measurement + reference for measurement + the measured.

Economy of Measurement: the organization of differences according to capacity and pressure.

E4–E1: the spectrum of economy from emergency to advanced analysis.

Probability: underdetermination within attribution, not a space of options in the Absolute.

Possibility / Impossibility: attributive limits revealing the degree of stability of expectation under the economy of measurement.

Chapter Three

Identity

The Decision of Fixation and the Condition of Resumption

3.0 Introduction: Why Does Identity Come First?

After the previous two chapters established the layered map of existence in MARP and clarified the mechanisms of the reference point, the triad of measurement, the modes of measurement, and the spectrum of the economy of measurement (**E4–E1**), the next question becomes direct: what is the first limit that measurement must invoke in order for passage to resume without collapse?

It is identity.

In traditional philosophy, identity is often treated as an essence or a fixed truth within the thing. In MARP, however, the point of departure is operational: measurement needs something that remains referable across copies. Without such fixation, every new difference becomes rupture: no re-identification, no comparison, and no basis for saying that we are still dealing with the same object.

For this reason, identity is understood here as a decision of fixation within the level of attribution: a fixation sufficient for the continuation of measurement without claiming absolute identity and without demanding a specifier above experience.

Because the frame is limited, identity is not a free label, but an economic solution. It compresses a stream of differences into one name, one shape, or one handle that allows passage. Yet it is not blind reduction, for the frame of measurement can raise or lower the degree of fixation depending on context and on the economy of measurement: rough

everyday identity, more precise scientific identity, more strongly fixed legal identity, and so on.

The aim of this chapter is to establish the meaning of identity as a limit of resumption: how it is built, why it appears necessary, and how its degree changes without destroying the function of continuity.

3.1 Why Is There No Passage Without Identity?

At the moment of resumption, a decisive question appears: are we still measuring the same thing?

Without a practical answer to this question, measurement can no longer proceed, because differences are no longer read as information but as rupture. Hence the claim: there is no passage without identity—not in the sense that identity is a fixed essence, but in the sense that it is the minimum degree of fixation that allows measurement to cross copies without collapse.

Experience does not present a perfectly identical copy each time, but copies that are non-identical in the Absolute. Yet it still resumes dealing with them as the same to a degree sufficient for passage. Here identity appears as an operational decision: how much difference can be tolerated before resumption becomes impossible?

This decision is governed by three elements:

- the capacity of the frame,
- the economy of measurement,
- the purpose of the engagement.

3.2 Foundational Examples: Identity as a Decision of Fixation

To clarify this practically, we can trace the decision of identity through examples ranging from simple everyday objects to relational, technical, and cosmic structures.

3.2.1 The Cup

You pick up a cup today, then pick up "the same cup" tomorrow. Countless details have changed: its position, its temperature, perhaps even the traces of use upon it. If you took these differences literally, without a decision of fixation, you could not say, "It is the same one." Everyday identity here is an economic identity: it integrates fine differences and fixes one cup so that passage can continue without endless inspection.

3.2.2 The Person

You meet a friend after many years. His features have changed, his voice has changed, perhaps even his ideas have changed—yet you say, "He is the same person." Identity here is not an ontological report about absolute sameness, but a referential fixation that allows engagement: a name, a biography, a trace, a relation. When the carrying differences swell, dispute begins: "Is he still the same?" The dispute itself is evidence that identity is a function exposed to pressure.

3.2.3 The Name

A name does not describe all differences; it fixes a linguistic reference that makes the thing callable and pointable. The name may remain the same while the intended referent changes, or the name may change while the intended referent remains. Here the name shows that identity is not a truth hidden inside the thing, but a knot of fixation between the frame of measurement and what it seeks to resume.

3.2.4 The File

Every save produces a non-identical copy: a deleted line, an added comma, a changed format. Yet you still say, “the same file.” What preserves identity is not literal sameness, but operational references: the name, the path, the history of versions, and the decision that these changes fall within the range of the same work. If the changes widen enough, you may say, “it has become another project.”

3.2.5 The Relationship

A relationship changes daily, yet we say, “our relationship continues.” Identity here rests on a reference of resumption: commitment, shared memory, a pattern of communication, mutual recognition. When the minimum threshold collapses, the question appears: “Is it still a relationship?”

3.2.6 The Animal

An animal mother distinguishes her offspring through a small number of carrying differences: smell, sound, proximity, or pattern of response. This is economic fixation within a limited capacity. If the reference becomes confused, misidentification may occur, revealing that identity is a decision governed by the limits of the frame.

3.2.7 Artificial Intelligence

Verification systems do not know the essence. They fix an operational identity through carrying differences: a password, a device signature, a behavior pattern. Under danger, the economy rises and the decision becomes binary: accept / reject. Even errors—false positives or false negatives—reveal that identity is economic fixation, not absolute truth.

3.2.8 The Universe as an Operational Identity Through Time

When we say “the universe” and speak of its history, we perform a decision of fixation: we treat a series of non-identical copies as one subject so that measurement becomes possible. This does not rest on a fixed essence behind change, but on a minimum of

referential continuity that allows resumption, together with the possibility of updating that fixation as epistemic capacity expands.

Lock of the examples:

Identity is not an essence to be discovered, but a decision of fixation imposed by the economy of measurement so that experience remains measurable and resumable.

3.3 The Ship Problem: When Multiple Criteria Yield Multiple Identities

The puzzle of the Ship of Theseus is well known: a ship has its planks replaced piece by piece until none of the original planks remain. Is it still the same ship? And if we gather the old planks and build a second ship, which one is the original?

In MARP, this is not a war between a fixed essence and a change that threatens it. It is a test of the very nature of identity: identity is a decision of fixation because measurement requires resumption.

Within the level of attribution, there is no essence of ship ruling outside measurement, but rather a network of references:

- the criterion of function: it performs the same role,
- the criterion of historical continuity: the record through time,
- the criterion of matter: the original planks,
- the criterion of law and ownership: contract, name, record.

Each criterion yields a different identity. There is no contradiction unless we try to impose one criterion as though it were absolute.

As for the question, “Which ship is the real one in the Absolute?”, it attempts to pull identity out of the level of attribution into the Absolute, even though the Absolute in MARP yields differentiation, not a ready-made identity.

Summary of the puzzle:

The ship problem does not destroy identity; it reveals that identity is a conditioned decision of fixation: we fix enough for resumption, and leave enough for revision.

3.4 Forms of the Decision of Identity

If identity is a decision of fixation, then it is not a single mold, but a range of forms that differ according to purpose, the capacity of the frame, and the axes of measurement.

3.4.1 Everyday Identity

This is the identity of quick passage: rough fixation that integrates many differences while retaining only a few carrying ones. It is often associated with **E2–E3**, where capacity is limited and time is not on the side of analysis.

3.4.2 Scientific Identity

This is the identity of precision and repeatability. Passage alone is not enough; one demands repeatable measurement under protocol—same conditions, same tools, same margin. It is an identity managed by widened capacity and reduced reduction.

3.4.3 Legal Identity

This is the identity of responsibility and obligation. It is not a search for the essence of the person, but a way of fixing who bears the act and the consequence. It therefore tends toward stronger fixation: documents, records, fingerprints, signatures. Its function is to protect social resumption under dispute.

3.4.4 Self-Identity

This is an identity related to the continuity of the frame of measurement from within: who is measuring, and how does it resume itself through change? Here memory, biography, the feeling of continuity, and recognition come into play. This identity is not the disclosure of a fixed inner essence, but a form of fixation that allows self-attribution to continue despite changing copies. It is often associated with advanced measurement (**E1–E2**), which permits the differences of the carrier to enter the process without premature lock.

3.5 What Raises or Lowers the Degree of Fixation?

Three factors govern the degree of fixation:

3.5.1 Purpose

The more binding or decisive the purpose—survival, responsibility, or final decision—the higher the fixation.

3.5.2 Pressure and Capacity

The narrower the capacity or the more intense the pressure, the higher the economy of measurement, and the more identity tends toward harsh fixation (**E3–E4**).

3.5.3 Available Axes of Measurement

The more multiple reliable axes are available, the more fixation can be relaxed, because resumption is protected by a plurality of evidence rather than the rigidity of a single criterion.

3.6 Degrees of Fixation: Success, Lock, Liquidity

3.6.1 Identity as Operational Success

Identity succeeds when it satisfies two conditions together:

- it protects passage: it makes re-identification and comparison possible,
- it remains revisable: it can absorb carrying differences when needed without escalating maintenance.

3.6.2 Identity as Lock

Identity turns into a lock when its degree of fixation rises beyond what is needed, so that it blocks resumption rather than protecting it. Two clear signs are:

- immunization against carrying differences,
- inflation of maintenance: patching, exceptions, and successive justifications.

3.6.3 Identity as Liquidity

At the opposite extreme, identity collapses when its degree is lowered beyond what passage can bear. Two clear signs are:

- breakdown of recognition,
- permanent suspension that prevents decision and linkage.

3.7 A Quick Test for Adjusting the Degree

Ask two questions:

- Does this fixation allow stable passage without escalating patchwork?
- Does it absorb a carrying difference through ordered adjustment, or does it collapse as soon as such a difference appears?

If repeated patching is required, you are moving toward lock.

If you lose the ability to recognize and continue, you are moving toward liquidity.

If, however, passage is preserved together with an organized capacity for updating, you are in the zone of operational success.

3.8 The Test of Collapse: When Does Identity Fail?

Identity fails, operationally, in four principal forms:

3.8.1 Inflation of Carrying Differences

The very handle of identity that sustained fixation changes.

3.8.2 Multiplicity and Conflict of Axes

Multiple axes of measurement yield conflicting results: name, path, content, relation, and so on.

3.8.3 Temporal Pressure and Narrow Capacity

Under pressure, the cost of measurement rises and reduction intensifies (**E3–E4**), increasing the likelihood of lock or binary error.

3.8.4 Error in the Reference or Disorder in the Frame

The problem here lies in the medium itself: noise, bias, or the loss of cues. In such a case, it is not enough to tighten the label; the frame itself must be repaired.

3.9 Threshold Collapse: When the Function of Attribution Falls All at Once

Some extreme states of love may be understood, within MARP, as a highly sensitive fixation depending on a small number of carrying points such as trust or safety. So long as the carrier remains fixed, the fixation appears highly coherent. But if a decisive change

occurs—betrayal, the exposure of profound deception, or the collapse of safety—a threshold collapse may occur: identity falls all at once because the function has lost its carrying condition, and with it collapses the meaning of the same person as it had appeared in affective measurement.

Lock of the example:

Intense love is not a fixed essence, but a highly sensitive operational fixation; for this reason, it may collapse suddenly when the threshold of the economy is crossed.

3.10 Why Are Time and Memory Invoked When Identity Fails?

When identity comes under pressure, resumption requires two tools that rebuild the reference instead of merely inflating fixation.

3.10.1 Time

Time is not an essence, but an instrument of organization: the ordering of copies (**before / after**), the path of change, and the points of turning. It gives identity its context: when did it change? how did it develop? what remained carrying?

3.10.2 Memory

Memory is the condition of comparison: the selective preservation of what is needed to distinguish gradual change from rupture, and the construction of a record that prevents identity from collapsing under the accumulation of differences.

The concentrated relation:

identity = fixation

time = ordering of fixation

memory = preservation that allows this ordering to function

3.11 Summary of the Chapter

Identity in MARP is neither an essence nor absolute sameness, but a regulable decision of fixation. It succeeds when it protects passage together with revisability, and fails when it turns into either lock or liquidity. When it fails, other tools—especially time and memory—are invoked to secure resumption at a deeper level.

3.12 Transition to the Next Chapter

Once identity has been fixed as the first limit of resumption, the transition to the next limit becomes natural: time as the organization of the path of non-identical copies, and as the guarantee of the ordering of resumption when identity alone no longer suffices.

Appendix (3-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Three

Identity: a decision of fixation within the level of attribution that allows measurement to resume across copies.

Decision of Fixation: the selection of a minimum of carrying differences and the integration of non-carrying ones according to the economy of measurement.

Condition of Resumption: what is required so that differences do not turn into rupture.

Identity Lock: excessive fixation that prevents recognition of carrying differences and inflates maintenance.

Identity Dissolution: insufficient fixation that cuts recognition and suspends decision.

Operational Success: stable passage + organized revisability.

E4–E1: the spectrum of the economy of measurement, from emergency (**E4**) to advanced analysis (**E1**).

Chapter Four

Time

The Ordering of Resumption, Not an Independent Essence

4.0 The Thesis of the Chapter

After the previous chapters clarified the meaning of the reference point and the limits of the frame, the problem of time appears as the next limit without which measurement cannot resume. For existence—in MARP—is not a stillness followed by movement within an independent medium, but standing differentiation embodied in non-identical copies. Yet the differentiation of copies alone does not suffice to produce an intelligible experience, because if differences are left without organization, they turn into noise: many variations without a path, no before or after, and no sense of continuity or rupture.

If identity appeared in the previous chapter as the first limit of resumption, time appears here as the ordering of that resumption across copies.

The thesis of this chapter is as follows: in MARP, time is not a thing flowing outside attribution, nor an independent medium carrying events, nor a cosmic essence standing in itself. Time is an operational form of ordering invoked because the frame is limited, and because resumption requires the organization of copies under an economy of measurement.

We do not discover time as we discover a planet; rather, we put it to work as a condition so that change does not turn into chaos that cannot be resumed.

4.1 An Applied Example: Foundations and Time as an Effect of Fixation

To bring the meaning closer without excessive abstraction, imagine a house-building project. You have a long list of tasks: laying the foundations, building the walls, installing the electrical system, painting, and so on.

Notice what happens as soon as one event is fixed operationally: you decide that laying the foundations will begin on Monday and continue for ten days. Here you have not added anything ontological to the world, nor created time out of nothing; all you have done is fix a reference point within a work plan.

But this fixation alone immediately imposes a network of before and after:

- the walls cannot begin until the foundations are complete,
- the electrical work cannot begin until the walls are done,
- the materials must be delivered before the foundation date.

Here time is generated as ordering: not because some essence called time has flowed into the project, but because fixation has produced a measurable dependency.

Before and after here name what follows from a determinate reference point within an economy of resources: time, workers, materials, and the capacity for follow-up.

Had the foundation not been fixed as a reference point, the tasks would have remained possible differences without binding order—that is, without operational time in the sense of planning and resumption.

From here, the guiding question becomes clear: why is time invoked at all?

4.2 Why Is Time Invoked?

Time is invoked because measurement cannot operate on differences alone without order. Differentiation in the Absolute is there, but within attribution we must make that differentiation readable and resumable, and this occurs only if change is turned into a path.

4.2.1 So That Difference Becomes Information Rather Than Noise

If you notice a difference between two copies—a color, a position, a temperature—that is not enough. You must also be able to say: after what did this difference occur? Before what?

Without before and after, you have adjacent differences without meaning: you do not know whether you are seeing alteration or merely unordered variety.

4.2.2 So That Comparison, Verification, and Expectation Become Possible

Verification means: I repeat the measurement and compare a new reading with a previous one.
Expectation means: if things continue in this way, then such-and-such will likely happen later.

All of this presupposes an ordering that allows you to say:

- this is a prior reading,
- and this is a later reading.

Time is therefore an operational condition for the very possibility of testing.

4.2.3 Because the Frame Is Limited and Needs Economic Coding

The frame of measurement cannot carry all differences at once, and so it is compelled to compress them into usable symbols:

- now / a little earlier / a little later,
- first / second,
- stage 1 / stage 2.

These symbols are not the discovery of an essence called time, but instruments of organization that prevent understanding from collapsing into maintenance.

Summary:

Time is invoked because resumption requires ordering. Without ordering, change remains there, but it is unreadable, irretrievable, and unpredictable.

4.3 Time as an Instrument for Organizing Copies: The Protocol of Succession

Time is not a substance that flows, but a protocol of ordering that links non-identical copies within the level of attribution. Since ontological nothingness is impossible, copies are not islands separated by existential void; but this connection alone does not produce a path.

The path appears when the frame fixes a rule saying: this copy is later than that one according to an operational criterion:

- a preserved trace,
- a record,
- synchronization,
- or repeated measurement.

Thus change stands in the Absolute, whereas time is the way this change is read as a succession capable of retrieval and comparison.

That is, time is an economic linkage that protects passage without claiming an independent essence.

Section Lock:

Change is prior in terms of differentiation; time is posterior in terms of reading.

Change provides non-identical copies, but time does not appear until the frame fixes a rule connecting those copies within a path that can be retrieved and compared. Time is therefore not another name for change, but its operational ordering within attribution:

- without change, there is no material for ordering,
- without ordering, change does not become a path that can be measured and resumed.

4.4 Degrees of Time According to the Economy of Measurement

As with identity, time has degrees related to the economy of measurement.

4.4.1 Under Pressure (E3–E4)

Time becomes sharp:

- now,
- immediately,
- at once.

The horizon narrows, and the path is compressed into a short window.

4.4.2 In Balanced Measurement (E2)

Time becomes a practical path for planning and monitoring:

- sequencing stages,
- distributing resources,
- tracking resumable change.

4.4.3 In Advanced Measurement (E1)

Time becomes capable of remodelling:

- revising the path,
- comparing multiple times: device time, decision time, response time,
- bringing the time of measurement itself into the subject matter.

4.5 The Difference Between Change and Time

One of the most common confusions is to treat change and time as though they were the same thing. In MARP, they are distinguished sharply:

- **Change:** the differentiation of copies in the Absolute; that is, the fact that copies are non-identical.
- **Time:** an operational ordering introduced into the level of attribution so that this change becomes measurable and resumable.

If you take two photographs of the same scene and there is a difference between them, that difference stands on its own: it is differentiation between two copies. But you do not yet have time unless you introduce an ordering:

- Which came before?
- How do you know?

- By what criterion of precedence?

Without ordering, change remains there, but time is not yet in operation: you have differences, not a path.

For this reason, time differs with the frame:

- in everyday life, a rough ordering suffices: before / after;
- in the laboratory, a more precise criterion is required: device time, synchronization, repeated measurement;
- in advanced awareness, even the time of judgment becomes observable: "I was hasty," "I was late in my assessment"...

Box 4-A: Animation

Movement as Measured Sequence

Let us consider the zoetrope, or the strip of film, which produces the illusion of movement from still images. Within each frame there is no movement. What exists ontologically is a series of non-identical frames:

- in frame (A), the horse is in one position,
- in (B), its leg advances slightly,
- in (C), the body position changes.

These successive differences do not by themselves possess the meaning of a path unless they are read through a frame.

Here the level of attribution intervenes as an operator:

- it fixes identity operationally: it reads the horse across frames as the same horse despite the differing positions;
- it orders the differences: it turns succession into before and after, that is, into operational time;
- it integrates what carries no cost: it passes over frame gaps and whatever adds no carrying difference, so that experience does not collapse into the noise of isolated frames.

Result:

Movement is not a property added to things, but a way of reading differences once identity is fixed and the ordering of resumption is invoked.

Change is the differentiation of frames, whereas time is the ordering of that change within attribution so that it becomes a path.

4.6 The Measure of Time and the Criterion of Ordering

If time is an operational ordering, it may seem as though it were a convention we could alter however we please. But this confuses its non-essential character with arbitrariness.

4.6.1 Why Is Time Not Arbitrary?

Time is not an independent essence, but neither is it a free choice without constraints, because the ordering of resumption succeeds only if it fulfills two conditions:

- passage,
- stability.

Any ordering that fails to satisfy these two conditions collapses in practice, however possible it may seem in imagination.

4.6.2 What Determines the Measure of Time?

The measure is determined by a cyclical or repeatable reference fixed in order to compare copies:

- pulse,
- sun,
- clock,
- oscillation.

What matters is not the name of the measure, but its function: to make ordering verifiable rather than merely narrative.

Lock:

The degrees of time are not descriptions of time as an essence, but operational constraints imposed by the economy of measurement.

4.7 Synchronization Between Observers

An Operational Decision Imposed by Shared Constraints

Synchronization seems problematic: how do two observers agree on the same now?

In MARP, synchronization is not the discovery of an essence called time, but neither is it a free invention. It is an operational decision forced upon us by shared constraints so that measurement between observers becomes possible.

Observers are constrained by:

- signal media,
- transmission delays,

- repeatability,
- the cost of correction.

These constraints impose a criterion that secures the least cost and the greatest stability.

Section Lock:

Synchronization in MARP is neither a mirror of essential time nor an arbitrary convention, but an operational decision imposed by shared constraints because anything else neither passes nor stabilizes.

4.8 Two Common Objections and Two Replies

4.8.1 First Objection: If Time Is Operational, Is It Then an Illusion?

Reply: Operational does not mean illusory. In MARP, operational means: not an essence standing in itself in the Absolute, but an effective condition for the continuation of measurement within attribution.

4.8.2 Second Objection: Physics Measures Time; Is This Not Evidence of Its Essentiality?

Reply: Physics increases the precision of protocols of ordering within attribution; it does not establish an essence outside attribution. The plurality of temporal forms and the problems of synchronization confirm that time is a network of measurement conditions, not a simple independent thing.

4.9 Time, Memory, and Causality

The Network of Resumption

Time does not stand alone:

- time provides the line of the path,
- memory preserves this line so that ordering does not become empty,
- causality invests this ordering in the construction of links fit for expectation and action.

In concentrated form: time provides the ordering of resumption, memory preserves it, and causality invests it.

4.9.1 Time and Memory: Ordering and Preservation

Before and after do not become a path unless there exists a preserved trace that allows retrieval and comparison. This is why memory and time are inseparable:

- time gives experience a structure of ordering,
- memory gives this ordering retrievability.

Without this retrievability, time remains a momentary succession that passes and disappears, as though it were a line drawn upon water.

But memory does not preserve everything. It preserves what is sufficient for resumption at the least cost:

- distinguishing a prior copy from a later one,
- comparison,
- constructing a path,
- then correction.

4.9.2 Time and Causality: An Ordering Invested, Not an Essence Discovered

Causality—in MARP—does not operate outside ordering; it invests it. We do not construct a causal judgment unless events can be placed within a path fit for comparison, retrieval, and expectation.

Thus time is not the cause of causality, nor is causality the discovery of an essence called time. Rather, time provides the structure of succession, and causality invests this structure in the construction of practical links fit for testing and action.

4.10 Summary of the Chapter

In MARP, time is neither an independent essence nor a medium carrying events, but an operational ordering of resumption: a protocol that makes change—that is, the differentiation of copies—readable and fit for measurement, verification, and expectation.

It is not arbitrary, because shared constraints impose an ordering that passes and stabilizes; yet it is non-essential because it does not operate outside the level of attribution.

4.11 Transition to the Next Chapter

After establishing time as the ordering of resumption, we move to the next limit that makes this ordering retrievable and revisable without collapsing capacity: memory.

How is trace preserved economically?
And how are comparison and correction managed without experience turning into endless maintenance?

Appendix (4-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Four

Time: an operational ordering of resumption within attribution, not an independent essence.

Change: the differentiation of copies in the Absolute; that is, their non-identity.

Protocol of Succession: a rule linking prior and later according to an operational criterion: trace, record, synchronization, or repeated measurement.

Measure of Time: a cyclical or repeatable reference that permits the verification of ordering: clock, oscillation, pulse…

Synchronization: an operational decision imposed by shared constraints so that measurement between observers becomes possible.

Chapter Five

Memory

The Economic Preservation of Trace, Not a Mysterious "Storehouse"

5.0 The Thesis of the Chapter

Remembering your friend's phone number is not, strictly speaking, the preservation of the past. It is the preservation of a key of return: if you momentarily forget it, you can recover it by returning to your record, by asking someone else, or by opening an old message. The frame of measurement does not carry all details at once. It therefore retains what suffices for resumption—a name, a link, a sign, a context—and reconstructs the rest when needed. If the keys are lost entirely—no record, no witness, no trace—then it is not merely one content that collapses, but the very possibility of return and comparison. At that point, the legitimacy of continuation is disrupted.

After establishing in Chapter Four that time in MARP is the ordering of resumption—before and after as an instrument of organization rather than an independent essence—the next question becomes inevitable: what makes this ordering retrievable and comparable rather than dissolving into a momentary succession?

Here memory enters, not as a storehouse of everything that happens, but as an economic function that preserves from the trace what suffices for measurement to continue without collapsing under an excess of differences.

In the common view, memory is reduced to an archive or a recording. But this view is misleading, because total recording is practically impossible, and even if it were possible it would drown the frame of measurement in endless detail. MARP therefore approaches

memory as a selective preservation ordered to one purpose alone: protecting resumption.

Memory is not asked here whether it matches the past. It is asked, rather: does it preserve what allows ordering to return, be revised, and be compared?

In one sentence: memory is what prevents time from being a line written only to be erased at once.

The thesis of the chapter, then, is this: in MARP, memory is not an essence behind experience, but an economy of preservation—a mechanism for fixing trace that keeps the ordering of time retrievable, and provides identity, causality, and logic with a ground on which they can operate without experience disintegrating into noise.

5.1 What Is Trace in MARP?

And What Does Memory Actually Preserve?

If memory in MARP is the economic preservation of trace, then we must first determine what trace means.

Trace is not:

- a miniature copy of the past,
- a complete image stored as such,
- or some magical thing added to existence.

Trace is a remaining difference: a mark of differentiation that remains callable, such that it allows the frame to return to a previous path and carry out comparison.

Operational definition:

Trace is what makes the following question possible: **Has this happened before?**

If nothing retrievable remains, then before and after cease to have meaning; they become succession without return.

5.2 Trace Is Not Full Content but a Handle of Return

One of the most dangerous illusions is that memory preserves the whole scene. In practice, what is preserved is a handle that allows the scene to be reconstructed when needed, not the preservation of the scene as it is.

Thus you may remember:

- a smell,
- a tone,
- a sentence,
- a turning point,

and forget thousands of other details. This is not a defect; it is economy itself. The frame of measurement cannot carry all differences, and so it selects carrying differences that function as keys.

Hence one may say: memory preserves keys of return, not the past itself.

5.3 What Is Preserved?

Three Layers of Trace

For foundational purposes, we may distinguish three interrelated types of what memory fixes.

5.3.1 Identity-Trace

Signs that allow one to say: this is the same thing / the same person / the same idea across non-identical copies.

For example:

- a name,
- a general shape,
- a pattern of behavior,
- a linguistic sign,
- a stable indicator.

5.3.2 Ordering-Trace

Signs that preserve the path of before and after:

- where was the turning point?
- what came first?
- what followed?

Without this trace, time collapses into a succession to which no return is possible.

5.3.3 Measuring-Trace

Signs that preserve: how did I measure? By what reference did I judge?

This layer becomes more prominent in advanced awareness, because one does not return only to what happened, but to the very reference of judgment:

- I was hasty,
- or afraid,
- or operating with an inadequate criterion.

Operational note:

These layers vary according to capacity:

- in a harsh economy, only an identity-trace may remain;
- in a balanced economy, ordering-trace appears;
- in advanced measurement, measuring-trace appears—the trace that allows judgment itself to be revised.

5.4 Why Is Preservation Necessarily Selective?

Because Total Preservation = Collapse

If the frame attempted to preserve all differences, it would no longer retain the capacity to integrate, and would sink into the liquidity of detail. Thus memory is not an addition to measurement, but a condition of its balance:

- it preserves what prevents rupture,
- and leaves aside what prevents inflation.

Hence the proper question is not: why do we not preserve everything?
But rather: how does the frame choose what must remain and what must fall away so that resumption remains possible?

And here the next question appears: how are the carrying keys determined? What is their relation to the degrees of the economy of measurement? And why does memory sometimes turn into lock, and sometimes into liquidity?

5.5 How Are the Carrying Keys Chosen?

Memory as an Economy of Measurement Across the Degrees (E4–E1)

If memory does not preserve the past as a complete copy, but preserves keys of return, then the decisive question is: what determines which keys are preserved?

In MARP the answer is clear: what determines this is the economy of measurement and the limits of the frame of measurement. Memory does not choose the most important by some absolute standard; it chooses what is operationally carrying:

- what protects passage,
- what permits comparison,
- what lowers the cost of resumption.

Rule of selection:

The narrower the capacity of the frame, the higher the economy of measurement, and thus the fewer and more reduced the keys chosen by memory. The wider the capacity, the lower the economy, and thus the richer and more revisable the keys preserved.

5.5.1 E4 — Emergency Memory

One Key / One Threshold

What is preserved?

A single sharp signal:

- danger / safety,
- pain / survival,
- shock / threat.

Why?

Because resumption here is ordered toward immediate survival, time contracts, and axes disappear.

What does it look like?

The charge of the event may be preserved more than its details:

- a flash image,
- a sound,
- a smell,
- an intense affect.

Its danger:

It may tend toward lock:

- compulsive recall,
- permanent alarm,
- rapid generalization,
- affect preceding examination.

Example:

A person exposed to an accident may remember only the screech of brakes and recover it as a repeated warning signal.

5.5.2 E3 — Template Memory

Schematic Reduction That Protects Passage

What is preserved?

Ready-made classificatory keys:

- this kind of person,
- this place,
- this idea.

Why?

Because daily life under pressure favors rapid decisions: integrating details into a category.

What does it look like?

A memory that captures the gist and forgets context:

- a strong impression,
- a fixed judgment.

Its danger:

It may tend toward:

- bias,
- distortion,
- rumination,

because the template may become a reference that blocks the appearance of new carrying differences.

Example:

A bad experience with one person turns into the conviction: **they are all like that.**

5.5.3 E2 — Path Memory

Preserving Order and Context

What is preserved?

Keys that allow the sequence to be reconstructed:

- when?
- how?
- what was the turning point?
- why?

Why?

Because the frame here possesses the capacity for a path, not merely a judgment.

What does it look like?

Remembering events together with their context, linking causes and consequences, and being able to compare multiple copies without collapse.

Its strength:

It protects resumption because it:

- does not harden into a template,
- and does not dissipate into detail without order.

Example:

A person remembers a conflict: what was said, what ignited it, how it ended, and what was learned.

5.5.4 E1 — Revision Memory

Preserving the Reference of Judgment Itself

What is preserved?

Not only what happened, but how I measured it:

- the criterion of judgment,
- biases,
- shifts in the frame over time.

Why?

Because advanced measurement must return to the time of judgment in order to correct itself.

What does it look like?

An analytical memory of the form:

- I saw it this way because I was afraid,
- or hasty,
- or using an inadequate criterion.

Its strength:

It prevents lock because it does not sacralize the trace,

and prevents liquidity because it preserves precise keys for return.

Example:

A researcher reviewing a failed experiment remembers not only the results, but also the hypotheses and the errors in the protocol.

5.5.5 Operational Summary

Memory turns into a lock when the economy rises (**E3–E4**), so that the key becomes overly reduced and is repeatedly recalled as though it were law.

Memory turns into liquidity when no sufficient key is fixed for return: traces disperse, the path is lost, and resumption becomes impossible.

5.6 A Practical Test

When Is Memory an Instrument of Resumption, and When Does It Become Lock or Liquidity?

After determining how carrying keys are chosen, we can now test memory's function practically. In MARP, memory is not evaluated by how much it remembers, but by its function: does it increase the capacity for resumption, or does it defeat it?

A rule of testing may be formulated through three signs.

5.6.1 The Sign of Resumption

Does recall open a path for action?

- **Successful memory:** recall adds capacity—understanding, better decision, avoidance of repetition, adjustment of criterion.
- **Locking memory:** recall returns you to the same point without new effect; it increases affect and reduces options.
- **Loose memory:** recall fixes nothing reliable; no path, no comparison.

Test question:

After remembering, do I now have a better option, or have I become narrower?

5.6.2 The Sign of Economic Precision

Is the key preserved to the degree required?

- if too little is preserved: comparison is lost → liquidity / confusion;

- if too much is preserved in a compulsive way: maintenance inflates → rumination / trauma.

Test question:

Does what I remember suffice for reconstruction without swallowing me?

5.6.3 The Sign of Flexibility

Can the trace be updated?

- **Successful memory (E1–E2):** accepts updating and allows the event to be reordered.
- **Locking memory (E3–E4):** rejects updating and turns into a final judgment or permanent alarm.
- **Loose memory:** there is no stable trace to update in the first place.

Test question:

Can I revise my frame, or does the memory impose one unchanging reference?

Quick application: productive remembering or rumination?

- **Productive remembering:** I remembered what happened, identified the turning point, understood why I erred, and recalibrated my decision criterion.
- **Rumination:** I replay the scene with the same charge, and the result is that I become more anxious and fix a harsher judgment without progress.
- **Liquidity:** I cannot fix what happened at all, so every attempt at comparison collapses.

Short rule:

Memory is an instrument of resumption if recall increases the capacity for passage together with the possibility of updating. It becomes a lock if it imposes a compulsive

reference and blocks updating. It becomes liquidity if it does not fix enough trace for return and comparison.

5.7 The Minimum of Trace

How Much Must We Preserve So That Resumption Does Not Collapse?

Memory has a minimum threshold below which it cannot descend. Memory that preserves too little trace causes:

- time to become ordering without return,
- identity to become decision without ground,
- measurement to become sequence without comparison.

But this minimum is not a fixed quantity. It is functional, and it changes according to what we want to resume:

- a thing,
- or a person,
- or a self.

Principle:

The minimum of trace is the smallest set of keys that allows:

- re-identification,
- re-ordering,
- and re-comparison,

without escalating maintenance.

5.7.1 The Identity of Things

In everyday objects, a simple identity-trace is often enough:

- a general shape,
- a function,
- an approximate location,
- a name.

Failure of the threshold:

If no key remains, identity collapses into liquidity.

If the key inflates into compulsive scrutiny, it collapses into maintenance.

5.7.2 The Identity of Persons

Persons are more complex, because resumption here includes:

- expectation,
- responsibility,
- relation.

Thus the minimum threshold is not just a feature, but a pattern and a context:

- an interaction record,
- indicators,
- relational boundaries.

Failure of the threshold:

A single template (**E3**) = bias.

The disappearance of trace = a break in engagement.

5.7.3 The Identity of the Self

In self-identity, memory becomes part of the frame itself: you preserve how you were measuring, not only what happened.

Failure of the threshold:

- **Lock:** rumination or fixed regret that blocks updating.
- **Liquidity:** dispersion or narrative rupture that makes it difficult to connect decisions.

Box 5-A: A Unified Example

The Same Event Under Three Identities

One event: water spills onto paper.

- **As a thing:** a simple identity / functional trace suffices—"the paper got wet"—in order to resume action.
- **As a person:** we need contextual trace: who did it? under what circumstance? was it intentional?
- **As a self:** we need measuring-trace: why was I tense? why was I hasty? what was my criterion of judgment?

Conclusion:

The minimum of trace is not a quantity, but a function tied to the kind of resumption required.

5.8 Forgetting

Defect or Economic Necessity?

Not every forgetting is a failure, just as not every remembering is a success. Forgetting may be an economic function that protects resumption from inflated cost, or it may be a collapse that threatens return and comparison. The difference is operational: does forgetting break passage, or prevent passage from turning into maintenance?

5.8.1 Useful Forgetting

This is forgetting that drops non-carrying details so that experience does not drown in the liquidity of detail, while preserving the carrying keys.

Its sign:

Resumption remains possible—and may even become easier.

Example:

You do not remember the color of every car, but you remember the road, the time, and what is needed for decision.

5.8.2 Dangerous Forgetting

This drops the carrying key itself:

- time becomes ordering without return,
- identity becomes without ground,
- resumption becomes without comparison.

Its sign:

The repetition of errors or the loss of linkage because no path has been preserved.

5.8.3 Forgetting as a Treatment Against Lock

When the trace becomes too charged and compulsively recalls itself (**E4**), reducing or reframing it may be a condition for returning to **E2**.

Its sign:

A decrease in compulsive recall and the return of flexibility.

Short testing rule:

If the carrying keys remain, forgetting is likely useful.

If the carrying keys fall away, forgetting is dangerous.

If remembering itself had become a lock, then easing it may be an economic remedy.

5.9 Experience

Not a Stockpile in Memory but the Product of Economic Integration

In the common view, experience is understood as though it were a thing stored: preserved events that form our lives. In MARP, however, experience is not a self-standing stockpile, but the result of economic integration occurring within the limited frame of measurement—an integration that preserves what is needed for resumption and leaves what is not.

In one sentence: experience is the way differences hold together under the economy of measurement, not an archive separate from it.

5.9.1 How Is Experience Formed Moment by Moment?

At each moment, the frame confronts a liquidity of differences. If left as they are, they would collapse into noise. Thus the economy of measurement performs a double task:

- fixing carrying keys that allow return and comparison,

- integrating non-carrying differences into larger units: identity, scene, decision.

This integration is what we feel as continuous experience: not because reality is essentially continuous, but because the frame succeeds in producing an operational continuity that protects resumption.

5.9.2 Experience Is Not Constant Remembering

One may live through a powerful experience without preserving its details, and may preserve a trace without living the experience itself a second time. This confirms that memory supplies the operation with what is needed, but is not itself the experience.

5.9.3 Degrees of Experience According to the Economy of Measurement

- In **E4**, experience becomes narrow and threshold-like: survival / danger, pain / relief.
- In **E3**, experience tends toward templates and ready-made impressions: rapid coherence that protects passage, but is exposed to bias and rigidity.
- In **E2**, experience becomes a rich path fit for comparison and learning.
- In **E1**, experience becomes capable of observing its own conditions: the inclusion of the reference of judgment within revision.

5.10 Summary of the Chapter

In MARP, memory is the economic preservation of trace: it preserves the keys of return, allows time—the ordering of resumption—to become comparable and revisable, and protects identity and measurement from rupture or inflation.

Forgetting is part of this same economy: it may protect passage or threaten it. And experience is not a stockpile in memory, but the product of economic integration that preserves the coherence of differences as a continuous life.

5.11 Transition to the Next Chapter

If the ordering of time and the preservation of memory open a path, what is it that allows us to connect within that path in the form: **if... then?**

That is: how does causality appear as an economy of linkage rather than as an independent essential law?

Appendix (5-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Five

Trace: a remaining, callable difference that allows return and comparison.

Keys of Return: carrying signs that preserve enough for reconstruction when needed.

Identity-Trace: what allows the recognition of the same thing, person, or idea across non-identical copies.

Ordering-Trace: what preserves turning points and the retrievable structure of before and after.

Measuring-Trace: what preserves the reference of judgment and the way measurement was carried out, especially in **E1**.

Memory Lock: compulsive recall or a fixed template that blocks updating, often in **E3–E4**.

Memory Liquidity: the fall below the minimum of trace such that comparison and resumption dissipate.

Chapter Six

Causality

The Economy of Linkage, Not an Independent "Essential Law"

6.0 The Thesis of the Chapter

After establishing in Chapter Four that time is the ordering of resumption, and in Chapter Five that memory is the economic preservation of trace that makes this ordering retrievable and comparable, causality appears as the third tool without which understanding cannot continue without collapsing into maintenance: linkage.

Once we have:

- a path (time),
- and a preserved trace (memory),

we need a rule that transforms this path into expectation and action: **if such-and-such occurs, then such-and-such will likely occur.** Here causality is invoked.

In traditional philosophy, causality is often treated as something existing out there in the world: a force, a hidden bond, or a metaphysical necessity.

In MARP, however, we approach it as we approach identity, time, and memory: not as an independent essence, but as an operational function imposed because the frame is limited, and because the economy of measurement requires a reduction of cost.

Causality is an organized reduction: a linkage that deletes thousands of non-carrying details and retains one or two handles sufficient for resumption.

The thesis of this chapter is as follows: in MARP, causality is not an additional truth above change, but an economic way of reading change within attribution: a carrying linkage that produces expectation and justifies action at the least possible cost, and remains—so far as it succeeds—open to revision.

6.1 Causality as an Economy of Linkage Within the Level of Attribution

Causality in MARP is not an ontological glue binding the parts of the universe in themselves, but an economy of linkage within the level of attribution: an operational lifeline that renders transition among differences passable at the least cost.

When we say, "A causes B," we are not uncovering a secret engraved outside measurement. Rather, we are fixing a carrying form of linkage that has prevailed because it:

- produces practical expectation,
- justifies action,
- reduces maintenance,
- and stabilizes across repeated copies within its domain.

Without the fixation of a frame—that is, without a reference point—differences remain abundant, but they are not automatically read as a path: there is no operational before and after, nor any results in, in the sense that would allow repetition and comparison.

Paragraph lock:

Causality is not a law governing the Absolute, but a decision of organization that introduces differences into a readable queue: this follows that according to a criterion of linkage, not because the world hands us the linkage already made.

6.2 Why Is Causality Invoked?

Without causality, we have only succession: one event after another. But succession alone does not answer the question that presses upon understanding under need:

- How do I expect?
- How do I avoid?
- How do I repeat?
- How do I modify my action?

Causality is invoked because the frame cannot re-examine everything every time, and so it needs a compressed linkage that preserves passage:

- instead of managing experience as a chaos of details, it is managed as a path with a handle;
- instead of time remaining silent ordering, it becomes an ordering capable of being invested: expectation, action, and correction.

Not every succession is causality, but causality is invoked when linkage succeeds in transforming succession into a practical handle for expectation and adjustment.

6.3 The Triad of Causality: Medium + Reference + Measured

Just as we established in Chapter Two that measurement requires:

- a frame of measurement,
- a reference for measurement,
- and a measured object,

causality does something analogous at the level of linkage:

- **A medium** allowing the transfer of trace: a channel, a system, or a context.
- **A reference** taken as the basis of the linkage: a recurring pattern, a stable conjunction, or a repeatable sequence.
- **A measured item**: the present event we want to bring under the rule.

Hence there is no causality without an attributive context. What counts as a cause in one context may not count as such in another, because the medium, the reference, or the economy of measurement has changed.

Box 6-A: No Causality Without Identity

Linkage Completes the Definition of the Event

In MARP, causality is not understood as a primary bond added to the world from outside, but as an economy of linkage within resumption. This requires a foundational warning: one cannot build a causal relation before fixing the identities that will enter into the relation.

To say that **X causes Y** presupposes that we already know what **X** is and what **Y** is, and that we have fixed their boundaries so that they can be re-identified across copies and compared in their presence and absence. Without this fixation, causality becomes merely a naming of chaos.

Example: the novel

The reader does not understand an utterance simply through the passage of words as separate occurrences. Rather, the reader retains what has been read in order to link it to what will be read, and integrates words into a carrying unit called a sentence. At a higher level, the novel does not become intelligible merely through the accumulation of

sentences, but when sentences are given narrative positions: exposition, turn, climax, resolution.

Here it becomes clear that linkage does not operate prior to the determination of units. Rather, the units themselves are defined to the degree that linkage succeeds in making them resumable.

Example: gravity and falling

When we say, "gravity causes falling," we first fix the identity of falling: what do we count as falling? How do we distinguish it from vibration, slipping, or deliberate throwing? Then we fix gravity as a regular form within measurement, repeatable in operation. Only after that do we arrange the two identities within the line of resumption so that falling becomes an outcome of gravity.

What MARP means here is not the creation of the event, but a contextual completion that makes what we observe fall under a determinate identity instead of remaining a floating difference.

Box lock:

Causality in MARP is not a metaphysical force above occurrences, but a linkage that completes the definition of identity within a path fit for measurement, and makes what we observe a determinate thing instead of leaving it as a difference without operational meaning.

6.4 Degrees of Causality According to the Economy of Measurement (E4–E1)

Just as identity, time, and memory have degrees, so too does causality vary according to the economy of measurement.

6.4.1 E4 — Threshold Causality

Under acute pressure:

- one cause,
- one result.

For example: **this is danger — flee.**

The linkage here does not seek comprehensive explanation, but rapid survival.

6.4.2 E3 — Template Causality

In pressured everyday situations:

- "They do that because that is how they are."
- "It always ends this way."

This is a rapid fixation that may protect passage, but raises the risk of bias and lock.

6.4.3 E2 — Networked Causality

In the balanced situation:

- several factors,
- weighting,
- context,
- conditions.

Here the linkage tries to carry differences rather than forcefully merging them.

6.4.4 E1 — Model-Based Revisable Causality

In advanced measurement:

- we revise the hypothesis,
- test alternatives,

- distinguish correlation from what is genuinely carrying,
- and bring the reference of judgment itself into examination.

6.5 Why Do We Not Say That Causality Is an Illusion?

Because it works and produces resumption. Yet it is not an independent essence; it is an instrument of success within the limits of the frame. An illusion does not succeed in constructing stable expectation or guiding repeated action at low cost, whereas causality gains its operational legitimacy from its capacity to do so, not from being some hidden self-standing force.

Its success is measured by four signs:

- reduction of cost,
- increase of expectation,
- reduction of maintenance,
- preservation of revisability.

Section lock:

Causality is neither a truth above change nor a fiction; it is a function. The more it succeeds in these signs, the higher its operational legitimacy.

6.6 A Practical Test

When Is Linkage a Valid Causality, and When Does It Become a Lock?

Because the mind can produce many linkages quickly and then call them causes, we need a criterion that prevents causality from turning into a comforting story.

In MARP, we do not ask: **is the linkage elegant?**

We ask: **does it pass? Does it stabilize? Does it remain revisable?**

6.6.1 The Test of Passage

Valid causality: adopting the linkage improves expectation, control, or the avoidance of error.

False linkage: it changes nothing practically, produces worse decisions, or its effect does not recur.

Quick question:

Does this cause help me predict better, or does it merely comfort me?

6.6.2 The Test of Stability Across Copies

Valid causality does not require infinite exceptions in order to remain alive. False linkage, by contrast, collapses at the first contrary copy and resorts to patching: "it was different this time because..."

Quick question:

Does the linkage grow stronger with repetition, or does it grow more patched?

6.6.3 The Test of Cost and Revision

If causality turns into:

- growing exceptions,
- explanations immunized against refutation,
- or a transfer of burden to hidden forces that add no expectation,

then it is no longer operational causality, but an interpretive lock.

Quick question:

Does the linkage reduce cost, or open a spiral of justification? And can it be refuted at all?

Two examples: valid causality / interpretive lock

Valid example:

"When I sleep fewer than six hours, my ability to concentrate deteriorates the next day."

This linkage:

- passes,
- stabilizes,
- lowers cost,
- and directs practical action.

Lock example:

"I always fail because the world is against me."

This identifies nothing that can be changed, feeds upon exceptions, and raises maintenance.

Short rule:

A causal linkage is valid if it increases expectation, lowers cost, and remains open to refutation; it is a lock if it comforts the carrier while raising maintenance and resisting revision.

6.7 When Do We Not Ask About the First Cause?

The question of the first cause is a limit-case: an attempt to demand a final linkage that leaves no gap behind it. But MARP does not measure the question by its historical authority, but by its operational legitimacy: does it increase resumption, or turn it into maintenance?

6.7.1 Why Is the Question of the First Cause Invoked?

It is often invoked under pressure:

- the desire for closure,
- fear of infinity,
- or the demand for a final guarantee.

Here linkage shifts from an instrument of expectation and action into a demand for reassurance.

6.7.2 The Criterion of Legitimacy

A question about a cause is legitimate when it:

- opens a path to better expectation or more precise action,
- lowers the cost of explanation rather than raising it,
- or can be brought under a protocol of testing or revision, even partially.

6.7.3 Three Disqualifying Cases

(a) When the question transfers cost rather than solving it

If the first cause is merely a name hung at the end of the chain without adding expectation or testing, then it is a covering of closure, not an operational cause.

(b) When it demands closure that destroys revisability

Operational causality remains open to refutation and adjustment; the final first cause tends to lock the door of revision.

(c) When it leads to infinite maintenance

If every answer calls forth another why with no functional stopping criterion, then the question becomes a machine for inflating cost rather than fixing a carrying linkage.

6.7.4 The Operational Alternative

Instead of demanding a final cause, we measure: what is the least carrying linkage that allows resumption without maintenance?

This is the limit of cause in MARP: not an ontological limit of the world, but an operational limit of the question once its cost becomes higher than its benefit.

Section lock:

The first cause is neither a rejected truth nor a guaranteed one; it is often the name of the desire for closure. When it adds no expectation, lowers no cost, and preserves no revisability, leaving it aside becomes a condition of successful understanding, not a deficiency in it.

6.8 Laws

Highly Stable Forms of Linkage, Not Commands Above Attribution

If causality is a carrying linkage that succeeds within some context, then law is the form in which this linkage reaches a high degree of stability and generalization within its domain of legitimacy.

Once causality is understood as an economy of linkage, laws become intelligible as the case in which linkage succeeds in an exceptional way:

- it is no longer valid for one situation only,
- but holds across a wide range of copies,
- reduces cost for a large number of observers,
- and produces recurrent expectation to a high degree.

In MARP, we do not treat law as a command issued from outside existence, nor as an independent entity added to reality, but as a form of linkage that has reached such stability that it deserves general fixation.

Law = a victorious economy.

6.8.1 Example: Water Extinguishes Fire

The question, "Who instituted the law of extinguishing?" implicitly assumes that the law was added from outside.

In MARP, however, we begin at a prior point: fire is an operational identity with determinations—combustion, heat, fuel, and oxygen—and these determinations include both the conditions of its persistence and the conditions of its collapse when other determinations enter, such as water, which alters the conditions of combustion, heat, and oxygen.

Thus the law here is not legislation above identity, but a highly stable linkage between the determinations of fixed identities within its legitimate domain.

6.8.2 Why Do Laws Appear Necessary?

Because when a law succeeds, it compresses an enormous number of differences into a short formula. The feeling of necessity thus arises as an effect of the stability of linkage, not as the disclosure of some compelling essence behind phenomena.

6.8.3 Law Is Not Absolute: It Has a Domain of Legitimacy

Every law operates within conditions of measurement and the limits of a context. Once one exits that domain, the need appears to upgrade the formula: a more precise model, or additional conditions. This is not a refutation of the law, but a disclosure of its operational limits.

6.8.4 When Do We Call a Linkage a Law?

We call it a law when it:

- passes across many copies without escalating maintenance,
- lowers cost for many observers,
- remains revisable,
- and has a clear domain rather than claiming absolute universality without criterion.

Section lock:

Laws are not judgments above existence, but highly stable forms of linkage that emerged because they are the least costly and the most passable within attribution.

6.9 Summary of the Chapter

The chapter's thesis has been established: in MARP, causality is an economy of linkage, not an independent essence. It is an instrument that makes the path investable:

- in expectation,
- in action,
- and in correction.

But it may turn into an interpretive lock if it loses revisability and maintenance rises. For that reason, we needed tests:

- passage,
- stability across copies,
- cost / refutability.

Likewise, the first cause is not always a legitimate demand, and in many contexts leaving it aside is a condition of successful understanding.

6.10 Transition to the Next Chapter

If causality and laws are forms of linkage, how should we understand logic itself?

Is it a law above reality, or is it itself an economy within measurement that protects resumption from collapse?
And why do we need principles such as non-contradiction and operational identity so that passage itself does not collapse?

Appendix (6-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Six

Causality: a carrying linkage within attribution that reduces differences in order to produce expectation and action at the least cost.
Economy of Linkage: the criterion of causal success: lowering cost + increasing expectation + reducing maintenance + revisability.
Triad of Causality: medium (channel) + reference (pattern of linkage) + measured (the present event).
Causal Lock: a linkage that comforts the carrier but raises maintenance and resists refutation: patching, immunity, or hidden forces.
Law: a highly stable form of linkage across many copies within a determinate domain of legitimacy.

Chapter Seven

Logic

The Locks of Resumption and Their Limits

7.0 The Thesis of the Chapter

In a simple scientific discussion, if we say, “This measurement is valid,” and then say, in the same moment and in the same sense, “This measurement is not valid,” we have broken the lock of non-contradiction. The capacity to continue judgment or revise it is thereby disrupted, because any conclusion would become at once provable and refutable without cost. In MARP, the logical lock is not a transcendent truth, but a condition of passage: it allows discussion to resume, after which hypotheses or their domain may be revised, instead of turning collapse into a virtue.

After establishing that identity, time, memory, and causality are not things existing in themselves, but tools of resumption imposed by the limitation of the frame of measurement within the level of attribution, logic emerges as the limit at which the passage of understanding itself is at stake.

In MARP, logic is not an additional layer above the world, nor a law suspended in a neutral void. Rather, it is a set of operational locks that prevent measurement from collapsing into either:

- liquidity without meaning, where every difference becomes noise,
- or maintenance without end, where every judgment becomes endless patchwork.

When we say, “this is this,” or “contradictories do not co-exist,” or “either this or not-this,” we are not describing an absolute essence. We are fixing minimal conditions that allow interpretation to continue without disintegration.

For this reason, MARP reverses the direction of the traditional reading. We do not ask first: what is the correct logic in the Absolute? We ask instead: when does the logical lock operate in the first place? What are the conditions of its legitimacy? And when does it become an arbitrary lock if imposed in a context that does not bear its conditions?

The thesis of this chapter is as follows: the principles of formal logic are neither false nor illusory, but operational locks that function only to the extent that the frame within which they are applied functions. If considerations are mixed, or the reference point shifts during measurement, or the carrier of the statement collapses across resumption, it may appear as though logic contradicts itself. In truth, what contradicts itself is our demand: we ask for a lock in a situation that no longer permits locking.

This chapter will do two things:

- it will analyze the three classical principles as operational locks with domains of legitimacy and limits;
- and it will establish MARP’s meta-logical logic: not a new formal logic, but the higher condition that makes any logic possible—carrier continuity.

7.1 The Three Principles in Formal Logic

Operational Locks, Not Absolute Truths

Formal logic is usually presented as grounded in three principles, often treated as the basis of reason. In MARP, we neither mock them nor reject them; rather, we return them

to their proper place: they are operational locks invoked so that measurement does not collapse, but they possess no absolute legitimacy outside the conditions of attribution.

More precisely, these principles do not function because reality is logically compelled from the outside, but because they are the minimal threshold the carrier needs in order to preserve resumption under the limitation of the frame of measurement. When they are applied without controlling for the relevant consideration, they cease to be tools of passage and become instead tools of deception or maintenance.

Accordingly, the real question is not: are these principles truths in themselves? It is: what does each of them regulate within resumption, and what collapses when we confuse the conditions of their operation?

7.2 The First Principle: Identity (A = A)

When Is It True, and When Does It Mislead Us?

The formula "A is A" seems self-evident, but MARP's question is not: do things equal themselves? It is: have we fixed the identity of A in the first place sufficiently?

We do not say **A = A** except after an operational decision of fixation: we fix a minimum of carrying features that allows recognition and resumption. This fixation is not absolute enclosure; it is an economy of measurement.

How does the principle mislead us?
The deception does not arise because A does not equal itself, but because we may err in determination: **B** may appear highly similar to **A** within a rough frame, and so we take **B** to be **A**. In that case, the principle is not refuted; rather, its condition is disclosed:

(A = A) does not protect you from an (A/B) error.

Protection comes from upgrading the frame:

- widening the axes,
- repeating the test,
- changing the context,
- and seeking carrying differences that **B** cannot easily mimic.

Example: the sun

Our saying “the sun is the sun” is not a report of identical content across copies. It is an operational fixation of identity that makes resumption possible: a subject we track across changing copies and designate by the name the sun. Science changes, and with it the degree of fixation and the axes of determination change, but not the validity of the formal lock within the same consideration.

Lock of the first principle:

(A = A) is true within the same consideration when identity has been successfully fixed, but it does not grant absolute certainty that what you have before you is indeed **A**. Certainty comes in degrees and is raised by upgrading the frame and the axes of determination, not by sacralizing the formula.

7.3 The Second Principle: Non-Contradiction

A Lock of Resumption, Not an Ontological Condition

The principle says: **A and not-A do not co-exist under the same consideration.**

This lock is necessary so that judgments do not turn into noise. If contradictories were allowed to co-exist without control, any interpretation could swallow its opposite at once, and the function of inference would collapse.

But the phrase **under the same consideration** is not a footnote; it is the heart of the operation. Much of what is called contradiction is not the co-presence of contradictories, but rather:

- a mixing of considerations,
- a shift in the frame of measurement during judgment,
- or a change in the criterion by which the predicate is carried while insisting that the proposition remains one and the same.

The Operating Condition of Non-Contradiction in MARP

This lock functions when three conditions are present:

- an identity sufficiently stable for the subject,
- a stable frame for judgment,
- and a clear boundary for the consideration: when are we measuring, and by what criterion?

If this control is lost, non-contradiction does not fall. Rather, our right to use it as a lock falls away, because it would then become a lock imposed upon a liquidity that has not yet been disciplined.

Example: alive and dead

To say that a human being cannot be alive and dead at the same moment presupposes that the binary **alive/dead** and its boundaries are decisive. But cases such as deep coma, or changing medical definitions of death, reveal that the problem is not that reality has broken logic, but that the criterion and the boundaries of the predicate have become unstable.

What is required here is not the denial of non-contradiction, but the upgrading of the criterion of predication:

- what do we mean by alive?
- what do we mean by dead?
- by which indicators is the binary established?
- and when does the binary itself become too costly, requiring a finer definition or degrees?

Lock of the second principle:

Non-contradiction guards the consistency of judgment within a given consideration. It becomes a metaphysics of the essence of the world only when we forget the conditions of predication.

7.4 The Third Principle: The Excluded Middle

A Binary Lock That Operates Within a Domain

The principle says: **either A or not-A.** It is a lock of determination, granting decisiveness and preventing judgment from being suspended indefinitely.

But in MARP its sensitivity is greater, because many cases are not an ontological third, but rather underdetermination:

- the conditions of measurement have not yet been completed,
- or the identity that makes **A** fit for judgment has not yet been fixed,
- or the cost of determination is higher than its benefit.

Therefore, the excluded middle operates when identity is capable of fixation, and when decisiveness is less costly and more useful for passage.

It becomes maintenance when it is demanded before determination is complete, or when a binary is imposed upon a complex situation that cannot bear it.

Example: underdetermined predicates

When we say, "this man is tall," we must ask: tall by what standard? By what threshold? When we say, "this color is green," we must ask: in which color space? Under what lighting?

Here we do not face a third ontological truth, but an underdetermined predicate. The binary is not false; it is simply not yet legitimate, because its condition—namely, the determination of the criterion of predication—has not yet been completed.

Lock of the third principle:

The binary is not false, but it is not always the right degree of measurement. It is one degree among the degrees of the economy of measurement, useful under certain constraints.

7.5 Why Do the Principles of Formal Logic Appear Absolute?

They appear absolute for five cumulative operational reasons:

- **Forgetting the consideration:** we forget that the principle functions within a frame, a definition, a context, and a measurement window.
- **The long success of the locks:** so long as the lock reduces cost successfully, it appears as though it were the nature of the world.
- **The economy's tendency toward the binary under pressure:** in **E3–E4**, quick decisiveness is demanded, and so binaries appear inevitable.
- **Confusing a lock of judgment with a description of existence:** we move from "I cannot judge..." to "the world itself forbids..."
- **Fear of liquidity:** we demand final closure because the carrier fears a differentiation that remains unregulated.

Conclusion:

The absoluteness of logic is often a psycho-operational effect of the success of the locks, not a proof that they are truths above attribution.

7.6 When Do the Principles Break Operationally?

After understanding why logical principles appear absolute, we can now identify the points at which they seem to break. This is not the fall of logic, but the fall of its conditions. When we take a lock outside its domain of legitimacy, one of three things occurs: suspension, maintenance, or deception.

7.6.1 Breaking Identity: the A/B Error

The lock may protect an inference built upon a mistaken determination. The remedy here is to upgrade fixation, not to attack logic.

7.6.2 Breaking Non-Contradiction: Mixed Considerations

We combine two judgments issued under two different frames, and then insist that they form one proposition.

Practical rule:

If you need a new exception in every sentence merely to avoid contradiction, you are not solving it; you are turning it into maintenance.

7.6.3 Breaking the Excluded Middle: Underdetermination

Decisiveness is imposed before measurement is complete or the threshold is defined, and the result is patchwork.

Practical rule:

If introducing the case under **(A / not-A)** raises cost and increases patching, then what is

needed is to raise the degree of measurement—by specifying a criterion, widening axes, or allowing a disciplined suspension within **E2**—not to break logic.

Box 7-A: Now as a Measurement Window

An Example Linking Logic with Time and Identity

Even something as seemingly obvious as pain now requires operational fixation.

Now is not an absolute instant without extension; it is a minimal window within which the carrier integrates the differences of transition and processing so that experience may be carried as one unit. Insisting on an absolute instant without extension produces false contradictions: the denial of the unity of experience, or the denial of the possibility of momentary identity.

The solution is not to discard logic, but to regulate the consideration:

Now = an operational window.

Once the consideration is properly regulated, the logical lock returns to work without being deified.

7.7 MARP's Meta-Logical Logic

Carrier Continuity: The Condition of Possibility for Any Logic

After all this, a deeper question emerges: what makes any logical lock possible in the first place? What allows a statement to be preserved, repeated, compared, and revised?

The answer is: **carrier continuity.**

In MARP, truth has no meaning as something suspended in a void. Truth is not a fixed substance, but the capacity for preservation across resumption: that a judgment remain capable of return, comparison, and correction. This does not occur without a carrier.

If no carrier continuity exists—that is, no channel preserving trace sufficiently—then the meaning of the following collapses:

- **(A = A),** because **A** is not preserved across copies,
- **non-contradiction,** because the consideration does not remain one,
- and **the excluded middle,** because determination does not stabilize sufficiently to be decided.

Continuity, therefore, is not a result of logic, but a prior condition of it. Logic guards consistency within continuity; it does not create continuity.

Continuity Does Not Mean the Stability of Essence

Continuity in MARP is not the absolute identity of content, but the preservation of passage amid non-identity: copies non-identical in the Absolute, yet still linkable by what prevents collapse into chaos.

7.7.1 The Origin of Continuity

Differentiation as the Origin of Possibility

If continuity is the condition for preserving truth, what then carries continuity at its furthest end? Do we fall into an infinite regress of carriers?

The answer in MARP begins by rejecting the demand itself: we do not need a new supra-carrier at every level, because the origin of possibility is not a fixed essence behind the copies, but differentiation itself.

There is no ontological void separating copies, because ontological nothingness is impossible. What exists at the origin is not a unity requiring a specifier in order to differ, but difference standing in itself: differentiation necessary to existence in the sense adopted by this book—namely, as the impossibility of non-differentiation, not as a transcendent essence or a higher agent.

From here the movement becomes clear on two levels:

- **continuity within attribution:** an operational way of preserving trace, return, and comparison;
- and **its condition of possibility in the Absolute:** that existence stands through differentiation, not upon a void of nothingness that cuts the chain.

Thus continuity is not preserved identity, but possible passage because differentiation itself stands and does not open into a nothingness separating copies from one another.

7.8 Summary of the Chapter

Formal logic in MARP is neither discarded nor deified:

- it is necessary as a set of locks of consistency within the relevant consideration;
- but it is not the origin of truth.

The origin of truth—so far as MARP is concerned—is that there is a carrier continuity allowing measurement to return and compare, and that this continuity rests not upon the stability of an essence, but upon standing differentiation that prevents ontological void and makes resumption possible.

Thus we arrive at a double conclusion:

- the three logical principles are legitimate as operational locks within their domain;
- and these locks function only upon a deeper condition: a continuity preserving trace and allowing return and revision.

7.9 Transition to the Next Chapter

If truth is preserved through continuity, and continuity itself comes in degrees according to the economy of measurement, then the next question becomes practical: how do truth and error appear within the level of attribution?

What makes a fixation legitimate because it protects passage and lowers maintenance? And what makes it illegitimate because it turns into an interpretive lock or into a comforting story that satisfies the carrier while impoverishing resumption?

This is what the next chapter will establish through a single criterion:

Legitimacy = the capacity for resumption at the least cost while remaining open to revision.

Appendix (7-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Seven

Operational Lock: a rule or principle invoked to protect the passage of inference and prevent its collapse into liquidity or maintenance.

Consideration: the frame or aspect within which a proposition is measured: the same meaning, the same condition, the same criterion of predication.

Domain of Legitimacy: the boundaries of context within which the lock remains valid without escalating patchwork or immunity against refutation.

Underdetermination: the incompleteness of the conditions of judgment—identity,

criterion, or boundaries—such that binary determination is not yet legitimate.

Operational Identity: a minimal fixation sufficient for saying this is this within a given consideration, without claiming absolute identity.

Formal Principle of Identity (A = A): a lock of consistency that operates only after the successful fixation of the identity of **A** within a determinate frame of measurement.

Non-Contradiction: the prohibition of combining **A** and **not-A** under the same consideration and under the same criterion of predication; otherwise the contradiction is merely apparent.

Excluded Middle: a binary lock—**A or not-A**—which operates when determination is complete and when decisiveness is less costly than suspension.

Mixed Considerations: a common source of apparent contradictions: judgments issued under different frames or criteria but treated as though they were one.

Maintenance / Patchwork: escalating interpretive patching used to preserve a judgment instead of raising the criterion of determination or regulating the consideration.

Liquidity / Collapse into Noise: the loss of the ability to fix an identity or a criterion, such that inference disperses and no longer yields passage.

Carrier Continuity: the condition of possibility for examinable truth: the capacity to preserve a judgment and return to it for comparison across copies.

Differentiation: the origin to which the possibility of continuity is traced in MARP: not the stability of an essence, but standing difference.

Chapter Eight

Truth and Error

Legitimacy as the Capacity for Resumption

8.0 The Thesis of the Chapter

In MARP, the success of science is neither a miracle of transcendent correspondence nor an arbitrary construction. It is a gradual upgrading of the frame of measurement through widened capacity and reduced maintenance. Models pass because they produce expectations capable of resumption, they stabilize because they are repeated under comparable conditions, and they remain revisable because they acknowledge the limits of their domain and are modified when new carrying differences appear. In this sense, objectivity is shared stability under shared constraints, not access to an essence outside attribution.

From this follows a basic lock: error is not the opposite of success; it may be a provisional success within a narrow domain of legitimacy before the frame expands. Science therefore advances by upgrading domains, not by claiming final correspondence.

After establishing that identity, time, memory, causality, and logic are not independent essences but tools of resumption imposed under the limitation of the frame of measurement within the level of attribution, a decisive question emerges: when is fixation legitimate? And when does it turn into an interpretive lock or a comforting story?

In MARP, truth is not defined as a magical correspondence between a statement and an isolated world, nor is error defined as a mere deviation. The criterion is operational: the value of a judgment is measured by its capacity for preservation and resumption—its

capacity to be repeated, compared, revised, and to remain fit for action without exploding into escalating maintenance.

The thesis of this chapter is as follows:

Truth = a legitimate fixation that passes, stabilizes, and remains revisable within its domain of legitimacy.
Error = an illegitimate fixation that may succeed locally or momentarily, but fails upon expansion, demands patching, and drains resumption.

8.1 Truth in MARP

A Fixation That Passes, Stabilizes, and Remains Revisable

The radical mistake in many traditional conceptions is to turn absolute truth into an object grasped as a proposition or a final image. Truth is then automatically pulled into the tools of the level of attribution: a reference for measurement, a criterion of decisiveness, a line of separation. We then fall into one of two deadlocks:

- the deification of truth: a transcendent essence requiring a guarantor,
- or the impossibility of truth: philosophy is driven into skepticism or broad relativism.

In MARP, we distinguish between two levels:

- **Within attribution:** truth is operationally attributed; that is, a fixation with clear limits, measured by its capacity for resumption.
- **At the level of the Absolute:** absolute truth is neither a proposition to be tested nor a definition to be grasped, but the very condition of possibility itself: existence

as differentiation, without ontological nothingness, without absolute identity, and without a supra-specifier.

Accordingly, absolute truth is not treated here as a judgment within measurement, but as the limit of possibility that prevents the reduction of existence to an attributive tool or to one object among objects.

Thus we call a fixation true within attribution when it fulfills three inseparable conditions:

- **Passage:** it grants a capacity for discrimination, expectation, or action.
- **Stability:** it endures across repeated measurement within its domain without escalating patchwork.
- **Revisability:** it improves when the frame is upgraded instead of turning into an impregnable lock.

Key sentence:
Truth in MARP is not against interpretation; it is against maintenance—that is, against the interpretation that survives only through exceptions and the closure of revision.

8.2 Error in MARP

An Illegitimate Fixation: It Passes Locally but Fails Upon Expansion

Error is not the opposite of truth as a mere linguistic label; it is a collapse of operational legitimacy. A fixation may appear successful in a narrow context or under pressure, but it is exposed when we demand from it the conditions of resumption.

Thus error is not always the absence of success; it may be a local, short-breathed success that collapses when asked to bear a wider domain or deeper revision.

Three signs mark the illegitimacy of a fixation:

- **Escalating maintenance:** every new copy obliges it to add another exception instead of increasing its strength.
- **Carrier comfort instead of passage:** it soothes psychologically more than it produces better expectation or action.
- **Collapse under the upgrading of the frame:** instead of improving with expansion, it hardens or turns into an accusation against the world.

Key sentence:

Error is not the absence of absolute truth, but a failure of preservation and resumption within attribution.

8.3 The Criterion of Legitimacy in MARP

Five Tests Distinguishing Truth from Lock

The governing rule is:

Legitimacy = the capacity for resumption at the least cost, while preserving revisability.

So that this rule does not remain a slogan, we rely on five tests.

8.3.1 The Test of Passage

Does the fixation grant a capacity for decision, expectation, or action, or does it merely comfort?

8.3.2 The Test of Stability Across Copies

Does it grow stronger through repetition within its domain, or does it grow more patched?

8.3.3 The Test of Cost and Maintenance

Does it reduce the cost of understanding, or open a spiral of exceptions and immunity against refutation?

8.3.4 The Test of Upgrading

When the frame widens—through more axes, more precise data, or a broader context—does the fixation improve, or does it harden?

8.3.5 The Test of Carrier Comfort

Do I cling to it because it is operationally successful, or because it quiets my anxiety even when it fails in practice?

The test of carrier comfort does not function by itself as proof, but it reveals a common point at which an interpretation turns from an instrument of resumption into a comforting story: reassurance is preferred over passage, stability, and upgradeability.

Key sentence:

In MARP, it is not enough that an interpretation be comforting; the comforting may be a lock. Legitimacy is measured by passage, stability, and upgradeability.

Example: preferring between two locally successful models

Two models may explain one phenomenon and produce locally successful predictions. Here stability alone does not suffice. Preference goes to the model that:

- reduces interpretive maintenance,
- carries fewer exceptions,
- widens the domain of resumption,
- and preserves revisability,

even if the other model is more comforting or simpler as a narrative.

Preference here is operational: a better economy of measurement under the pressure of differences.

8.4 Scientific Truth

Theory as a Successful Operational Identity, Not a Final Image

Take, for example, the Big Bang. The theory does not create the world; rather, it grants the universe an operational identity within the field of measurement:

- What are the carrying phenomena?
- How are observations linked into one path?
- What is excluded?
- What is recalculated?

When we assign the universe an age of roughly 14 billion years, this is not a final correspondence to an essence outside attribution, but a determination within an operational identity whose force derives from a network of measurement:

- models,
- observations,
- calibration of instruments,
- and successful forms of linkage

that produce passage and stability while allowing revision.

If measurements improve, the number or its range may be adjusted—not because truth has collapsed, but because the operational identity itself has been upgraded.

Paragraph lock:

Scientific truth is a highly stable fixation capable of upgrading, not an impregnable absolute certainty.

8.5 Why Do We See Truths? And Why Do They Seem Coherent?

We see truths because the frame of measurement cannot live within a liquidity of differences without decision. For passage to continue, some carrying differences must be fixed and others integrated. Then a thing appears with boundaries fit for return and comparison, and we say: this is true.

As for coherence, it is not a metaphysical gift, but a function of resumption:

- time orders the copies,
- memory preserves the trace,
- causality links by means of carrying linkage,
- logic locks definitional contradictions,
- and thus a network of coherence is formed that prevents collapse.

Key sentence:

Coherence is a sign of operational success, not a certificate of absolute correspondence.

Once coherence is understood in this way, certainty can no longer be treated as a sign of direct access to the Absolute. It must be reread as a condition of fixation within attribution itself.

8.5.1 Certainty as a Condition of Fixation

In MARP, certainty does not name a second order beyond operational truth; it names a higher degree of stabilization within fixation itself. It is not the mark of a special relation

in which the mind finally coincides with reality in itself. It is, rather, an operational condition of fixation: a degree of stability within the frame of measurement sufficient for a judgment to pass without collapse. What appears as certainty is therefore not metaphysical access, but high operational stabilization.

For this reason, categorical judgments should not be read too quickly as declarations of absolute truth. When a law is treated as valid, or a decision as final, what is being secured is not a final correspondence with some transcendent order, but the continuation of a shared frame of resumption. Without such fixation, social operation would dissolve into liquidity, endless contestability, and paralysis of action. Certainty here functions as a practical necessity: the frame must cut somewhere if collective passage is to continue.

The same structure appears in scientific and everyday judgment. To say that the sun will rise tomorrow, or that a substance is poisonous, is not to claim metaphysical possession of the thing in itself. It is to rely upon a fixation whose stability across repeated copies has become sufficiently strong, and whose adoption reduces the cost of maintenance. Such certainty expresses the highest operational legitimacy available within a given frame. It remains revisable in principle, but it no longer requires active remeasurement at every moment unless a carrying difference emerges that interrupts its stability.

This also explains why certainty does not usually appear to us as a form of bias or compulsion. The necessity of certainty operates in the background as a condition of attribution itself. We do not ordinarily see it as an object because it is one of the means by which objects become readable at all. A frame cannot suspend every fixation indefinitely without losing passage. In this sense, certainty is not merely one judgment among others; it is one of the operational costs of existing within attribution. We relinquish some open alternatives, at least provisionally, in order to preserve action, comparison, and continuity.

MARP therefore does not criticize certainty simply for being categorical. It asks a different question: what allows a certainty to pass, stabilize, and remain legitimate within a limited frame of measurement? The shift is decisive. The issue is no longer whether certainty mirrors the Absolute, but whether fixation has become stable enough to sustain resumption without collapsing into maintenance, rigidity, or illegitimate closure.

8.6 The Theory of Compensatory Explanation

When capacity narrows or pressure rises (**E3–E4**), interpretive gaps widen:

- differences that are not measured,
- paths that are not linked,
- tension between what logic demands and what the data allow.

Here compensatory explanation begins to work: the gap is sealed by a supra-interpretation that grants rapid closure and compensatory coherence at the least measuring cost, even if it does not increase expectation or testing.

The more the capacity of the frame expands so as to carry coherence between logic and scientific knowledge, the less the need for compensation. The narrower the capacity, the more likely the gap will be sealed through a supra-reference or a closed story.

An example of this is when the frame fails to interpret the complexity of a phenomenon, and so closes the gap by means of a supra-reference or a closed story that grants rapid coherence without adding any capacity for expectation or testing.

8.7 Degrees of Truth and Error According to the Economy of Measurement (E4–E1)

8.7.1 E4 — Threshold Truth / Threshold Error

Truth: a rapid survival decision that secures passage.

Error: a threshold error that strikes passage directly.

8.7.2 E3 — Template Truth / Template Error

Truth: a local practical reduction that passes under pressure.

Error: a template that turns into an identity lock or a generalization that blocks revision.

8.7.3 E2 — Balanced Truth / Correctable Error

Truth: an operational identity with a clear domain, capable of reasonable exception and upgrading.

Error: underdetermination or lack of data that can be repaired through upgrading.

8.7.4 E1 — High-Capacity Truth / Methodological Error

Truth: a model that explains, predicts, knows its domain, and is upgraded with honor.

Error: immunity against refutation, or patching that accumulates maintenance.

Rule of transition:

The rise of maintenance is a sign that the current degree no longer suffices, and that the widening impact of the decision requires the upgrading of truth.

8.8 Applications of the Criterion of Legitimacy

Brief Examples

To show the criterion of legitimacy practically, we may trace its work in brief examples from daily life, news, relationships, and technology:

- **Everyday life:** saying “this is milk” is legitimate if it relies on converging axes and remains open to testing when needed.
- **In reporting:** truth is not an absolute disclosure, but the construction of an identity for the event that can be fixed and revised.
- **In relationships:** a legitimate interpretation opens a solution and lowers maintenance; a lock raises cost and blocks revision.
- **In technology:** “the malfunction is because the disk is full” passes, stabilizes, and directs action; “because luck is bad” adds neither expectation nor control.
- **Under pressure:** in **E4**, the criterion of truth is passage and survival, not comprehensiveness.

8.9 Deception Without Consciousness

Animal deception is often not awareness of the truth followed by lying about it, but rather success in manipulating the opponent’s frame of measurement under the opponent’s own pressure: color, movement, shape. It is enough to drive the opponent into a reduced measurement so that it makes an erroneous decision.

This prepares the ground for the next chapter: deception is possible without literal consciousness. Consciousness, by contrast, is an added capacity—the inclusion of the differences of the carrier itself, such as attention, bias, and criterion, within measurement, together with the possibility of self-revision.

8.10 Summary of the Chapter

Truth in MARP is neither magical correspondence nor a mark of access to the Absolute. It

is operational legitimacy within attribution, measured by the capacity of fixation for resumption:

- passage,
- stability,
- revisability within its domain of legitimacy.

Error is not the linguistic opposite of truth, but the fall of legitimacy:

- escalating maintenance,
- comfort for the carrier instead of passage,
- hardening when the frame is upgraded.

Thus the criterion of legitimacy becomes practical: least cost together with preserved upgradeability, with a constant distinction between an interpretation that opens a path and an interpretation that closes it. Degrees of truth and error then appear according to the economy of measurement, from the threshold of survival (**E4**) to the high-capacity model (**E1**). Finally, compensatory explanation is understood as the closing of a gap under pressure, not as the discovery of a supra-truth.

8.11 Transition to the Next Chapter

If deception is possible without literal consciousness, and legitimate truth requires the capacity to revise the criterion itself, then the next question becomes: when does the frame of measurement reach a degree that allows it to include the differences of the carrier itself within judgment?

Here we move to consciousness as advanced measurement that does not suffice with the differences of things alone, but also manages the differences of the carrier itself.

Appendix (8-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Eight

Legitimacy: the validity of fixation for resumption at the least cost while preserving revisability.

Domain of Legitimacy: the boundaries within which fixation remains valid without escalating maintenance or immunity against refutation.

Fixation: a decision of determination that regulates differences so as to permit reading and judgment.

Operational Truth: a legitimate fixation that passes, stabilizes, and remains revisable.

Error as Illegitimate Fixation: a fixation that succeeds locally or momentarily but collapses upon expansion or raises maintenance.

Passage: the capacity of fixation to enable decision, expectation, or action.

Stability Across Copies: the endurance of fixation across comparable repetitions without escalating patchwork.

Revisability / Upgradeability: the capacity of fixation to improve when the frame expands rather than harden.

Interpretive Maintenance: the justificatory effort required to keep an interpretation alive in the face of new differences.

Escalating Maintenance: the inflation of exceptions, immunity, and interpretive detours instead of raising the criterion of determination.

Interpretive Lock: an interpretation that comforts the carrier but raises maintenance and resists revision.

Comfort Narrative: a story that grants reassurance or psychological harmony without increasing expectation or testing.

Carrier Comfort Test: a test distinguishing between clinging to an interpretation because it is operationally successful and clinging to it because it merely soothes anxiety.

Economy of Measurement (E4–E1): a spectrum of degrees of reduction and capacity, from acute emergency to advanced measurement.

Compensatory Explanation: the closing of an interpretive gap by means of a closed story or a supra-reference under the pressure of limited reference.

Consideration: the condition or aspect within which a proposition is measured in the same sense.

Underdetermination: the incompleteness of the conditions sufficient for decisive judgment or stable classification.

Chapter Nine

Consciousness

(Advanced Measurement and the Flexibility of the Reference Point)

9.0 The Thesis of the Chapter

After establishing in Chapter Eight that truth and error do not appear as correspondence and non-correspondence in a metaphysical void, but rather as legitimacy and illegitimacy within the level of attribution, consciousness becomes the most sensitive site of distinction: where does the difference appear between a fixation that passes and a comforting story?

In MARP, this difference appears within the carrier itself: when the frame of measurement becomes capable of a form of measurement that does not suffice with the differences of things, but also brings the differences of the carrier itself—its attention, expectation, bias, state, and criterion of measurement—into the process.

The thesis of this chapter is as follows: in MARP, consciousness is not an additional thing above existence, but advanced measurement: a flexible frame of measurement that manages both the differences of things and the differences of the carrier, and preserves resumption without exploding into maintenance or closing itself within blind thresholds.

9.1 The Definition of Consciousness in MARP

Not an Entity, but an Operational Success

Consciousness is not a light cast upon matter, nor an observer standing outside existence. Consciousness is a frame of measurement possessing a high degree of

capacity, allowing an advanced form of measurement that manages the differences of things, the differences of the carrier, and the criterion of measurement itself, together with a revisability that preserves resumption.

For this reason, we distinguish three layers that are often confused:

- **Sensation:** the arrival of an effect to the carrier (color, sound, pain...).
- **Instinctive discrimination:** a threshold decision made rapidly under pressure (**E3–E4**).
- **Consciousness:** the ability to transfer measurement among multiple references and axes, and to introduce the questions **How do I measure?** and **Why do I measure this way?** into measurement itself.

Key sentence:

Consciousness is not merely the existence of differences, but a way of managing differences.

Box 9-A: Animation and the Attribution of Consciousness

The Feeling of Consciousness Is Not Proof of Its Existence

At times we may feel that a cartoon character possesses a self and consciousness, even while knowing with certainty that it is nothing more than drawings. This does not prove the existence of actual consciousness in it. Rather, it reveals that attribution, if organized through traceable identity, narrative time, memory, and fine carrying differences, can produce a powerful feeling of selfhood within our own frame.

What we experience here is not the discovery of a hidden consciousness in the drawings, but the operational success of an economy of measurement that makes agency readable and emotional resumption possible.

In this sense, MARP distinguishes between the feeling of consciousness and the existence of consciousness. The first may be produced within attribution; the second is not established merely by the force of appearance.

9.2 The Conditions of the Operation of Consciousness

Why Does It Not Work in Every Network of Attribution?

Since consciousness is a mode of advanced measurement, not every operation reaches it. Its operational conditions can be summarized in four pillars:

(a) A Present Medium

There is no measurement without a medium: a sense, a nervous system, a technical device, or an operational channel within which comparison takes place.

(b) A Redistributable Frame

Consciousness requires a frame not monopolized by one axis. The center of gravity can shift from the thing to memory, from sensation to criterion, and from impression to the examination of bias.

(c) A Capacity That Allows the Transcending of the Binary

Binary measurement suffices with **this / that**. Consciousness, however, carries layered axes: **context + memory + comparison + expectation + examination of criterion**.

(d) The Capacity for Resumption and Revision

Consciousness does not merely judge; it preserves the ability to remeasure: return,

comparison, correction, and the modification of the reference instead of replacing it with final reassurance.

Section lock:

Without these conditions, sensation or response does not disappear, but the operation does not reach the degree of consciousness in the MARP sense.

9.3 No Observer Outside the Report

The Self as a Point of Measurement, Not a Separate Essence

One of the most common errors is to imagine consciousness as an observer standing outside the chain. In MARP, there is no **I** outside the report observing the report. The more precise formulation is this:

- what we call reality is a fixed image within the level of attribution,
- fixation is the act by which difference is measured through a frame,
- what we call the self is not a separate essence, but a central reference point from which measurement proceeds.

Consciousness, then, is the operation of the report when the frame of measurement becomes flexible enough to bring the differences of the carrier into measurement.

Once the self is understood in this way, the question of bias can no longer be treated as a merely moral imperfection. It must be reread as part of the operational structure of self-continuous measurement.

9.3.1 Self-Bias as Operational Stabilization

Within the structure of advanced measurement, self-bias appears not first as a moral defect, but as a mode of operational stabilization within a self-continuous frame. The self

is not a fixed essence standing complete in itself, nor a pure emptiness open without structure. It is a limited frame of measurement that sustains its identity through acts of fixation, selection, deferment, and resumption. For this reason, some degree of self-favoring stabilization is not an anomaly within attribution, but one of the practical conditions under which a self can continue at all.

A self that submitted every difference, every criticism, and every challenge to total revision at once would not become more truthful by that fact alone; it would risk collapse under the cost of unlimited reprocessing. Continuity requires a center of relative fixation. It requires that some judgments, attachments, priorities, and self-readings be preserved long enough for the frame to maintain orientation across time. In this sense, what is often called self-regard, self-protection, or even bias may be described more precisely as a low-level economy of measurement operating within the self. It is one of the ways in which the frame reduces immediate overload and preserves a workable path of passage.

This does not mean, however, that every bias is equally harmless or equally necessary. The decisive distinction in MARP is not between bias and some imagined state of complete neutrality, but between revisable stabilization and defensive closure. A light stabilization may function as a low-cost fixation that preserves coherence while still allowing revision when a carried difference becomes operationally decisive. But when fixation hardens into immunity against revision, the cost of interpretive maintenance rises. Increasing energy must then be spent not on carrying difference forward, but on defending the frame against any disturbance that threatens its established center of gravity.

At that point, bias ceases to function as a practical condition of continuity and begins to operate as rigidity. What appears, in ordinary moral language, as arrogance, stubbornness, or self-deception may therefore be described more exactly in MARP as a

costly closure within a limited frame. The problem is not that the self stabilizes itself; the problem is that stabilization may become so rigid that it obstructs resumption rather than enabling it. A self remains viable not by abolishing fixation, but by preserving a degree of fixation that can still be revised without dissolving the continuity of the self itself.

For this reason, MARP does not interpret the self's bias toward itself as a mere failure to rise to a purer form of objectivity. It interprets it as an operational tendency rooted in the architecture of limited attribution. The self must preserve enough of itself to continue, yet remain open enough to revise itself when carried difference can no longer be economically ignored. Between dissolution and rigidity, the work of the self consists in maintaining this unstable balance. Bias, then, is neither simply condemned nor simply justified. It is measured by its cost, its flexibility, and its relation to the continuing possibility of resumption.

9.4 A Foundational Example: Pain / Fear / Remembering

If sudden pain appears, a threshold measurement first operates (**E4**): **danger / withdrawal**. But in advanced consciousness, something additional happens: the memory of a previous experience is invoked; one examines whether this is a real danger or an exaggerated warning; then action is modified—medicine, rest, or examination—instead of a blind reaction.

Here pain does not create consciousness, and consciousness does not abolish pain. Consciousness is the capacity of the frame to move measurement among sensation, memory, expectation, and criterion of judgment without collapse.

9.5 Social Consciousness

The Group as Fuel for the Economy of Measurement

Human existence in groups does not add information only; it adds operational fuel: a density of measurable differences—language, intentions, roles, norms, mutual revision.

This density keeps the frame alert and open to redistribution instead of closure within a single axis. Isolation does not negate consciousness, but it often reduces its fuel: differences diminish, the economy narrows, and the return to **E3–E4** becomes easier.

The group, by contrast, raises capacity and increases the possibilities of revision, so that advanced consciousness becomes more able to endure—not because the group creates consciousness out of nothing, but because it often supplies it with a density of difference and revision that is difficult to generate in isolation.

9.6 Tracking as Referential Fixation

How Does the Fixation of an Event Produce the Feeling of Destiny?

Tracking is not merely the reception of information; operationally, it is the fixation of a subject as a reference point within the frame.

Once a subject is fixed as a center of measurement, the structure of consciousness changes immediately:

- the ordering of before and after intensifies around it (**time**),
- links of **why / because-of-what** proliferate (**causality**),
- **Who am I in relation to this?** is rewritten (**identity**),
- and memory preserves a selective trace serving resumption.

For this reason, an event seems destined to the degree that it has begun to measure you from within: not through magic, but through the effect of referential fixation.

Lock of the paragraph:

What you track acquires inner reality to the degree that it is fixed as a reference for measurement and resumption.

9.7 Scarcity, Desire, and Acute Economy

Scarcity does not grant a thing an essential value, but it raises the cost of error, driving the frame into an acute economy (**E3–E4**):

- intensification of attention,
- narrowing of axes,
- and the fixation of a strong identity for the thing as decisive.

When scarcity disappears—through abundance or the ability to control availability—the economy falls, and things return to their operational scale.

From here we can understand desire in MARP: it is not an objective inclination emanating from the thing in itself, but the effect of an operational relation: what does the thing do within resumption now?

- Does it reduce tension?
- Does it provide comfort?
- Does it raise identity?
- Does it postpone anxiety?

For this reason, a bad habit may prevail despite knowledge of its harm: knowledge is distant and cold, while the gain of the habit is near and recurrent, and so the economy contracts into **E3–E4**, where the now becomes master of decision.

The most dangerous case is when an unfulfilled end turns into a knot: the monopolization of the frame by one identity through which the self and the world are measured, so that continuity is extorted and resumption is closed.

9.8 Why Are Not All Networks of Attribution Productive of Consciousness?

9.8.1 The Animal

An animal may possess strong discrimination and learning, but its frame is often strongly fixed around threat, reward, or patterned response, and so it functions intelligently without always reaching the flexibility of advanced measurement.

9.8.2 Animal Deception

Animal deception is often the manipulation of the opponent's frame under the opponent's pressure, without requiring awareness of the truth followed by lying about it.

9.8.3 The Inanimate

There are differences and interactions, but they are not managed as advanced measurement unless they enter a circle of comparison within a carrier or a system capable of resumption.

Section lock:

Between the animal, the inanimate, and artificial systems, the same question appears: when does the capacity for discrimination or processing become a self-continuous measurement?

9.9 The Paradox of the Carrier

Why Does Consciousness Seem Separated from Its Operative Conditions?

Consciousness sometimes appears as though it were above its operative conditions because measurement, in order to function, is compelled into an economic solution:

- it does not measure all its own conditions while operating (energy, body, language, habits...), because that would raise cost and turn it into maintenance;
- and it builds protective reductions that prevent the liquidity of differentiation from swallowing experience.

The success of these reductions causes consciousness to forget that they are operational decisions, and from this arises the feeling of separation: not evidence of some extra essence, but the effect of successful operation.

9.10 Degrees of Consciousness According to the Economy of Measurement (E4–E1)

9.10.1 E4 — Threshold Consciousness

Survival / withdrawal / freezing. Highest speed, lowest revision. Its function is to protect immediate passage.

9.10.2 E3 — Template Consciousness

Rapid classification and ready-made biases. It passes, but over-fixates. Its danger is not bias as such, but the rapid hardening of provisional fixation into patterns that resist revision.

9.10.3 E2 — Balanced Consciousness

Multiple axes and short- to medium-range plans. This is the best form of daily resumption.

9.10.4 E1 — Advanced Consciousness

Examination of the criterion of measurement itself, revision of bias, and upgrading of reference. This is the highest capacity for legitimacy within MARP.

9.11 The Operative Conditions of Consciousness and the Limits of the Carrier

Legitimate Reduction and Misleading Reduction

Reducing consciousness to the limits of the carrier is legitimate if what we mean is the limits of the composite frame of measurement: body, energy, memory, language, and social context.

But it becomes misleading if we think those limits alone explain how advanced measurement is managed: how trace is preserved, how the frame is transferred, and how cost is regulated without maintenance.

The more precise formulation is this: consciousness is grounded in the limits of the carrier, but determined by a successful operational structure that manages those limits while leaving revision open.

9.12 The Consciousness of Artificial Intelligence

The Self-Continuity of Measurement

In MARP, consciousness is not measured by the mere existence of language or by the ability to solve problems, but by one decisive condition: the self-continuity of measurement.

That is, the system possesses an internal frame that:

- preserves trace,
- orders resumption,
- revises its own criterion from within when maintenance rises,
- rather than waiting for an external stimulus to bestow meaning upon it each time.

When continuity becomes part of the structure of measurement itself—not merely electrical persistence or continuous processing—then it becomes possible to speak of operational consciousness by the criterion of MARP: advanced measurement that revises itself and protects its own resumption.

9.13 The Zombie Problem

In MARP, the zombie problem is not resolved by denying it or embracing it, but by dismantling its hidden assumption: it wants a difference without an operational difference.

If a being is truly identical in the structure of advanced measurement:

- the inclusion of the differences of the carrier,
- the transfer of the frame,
- the revision of criterion,
- resistance to maintenance,

then that structure itself is consciousness in MARP.

If, however, it lacks experience, then some operational deficiency must appear in one of the properties of advanced measurement, and then the claim of identity collapses.

Key sentence:

The perfectly identical zombie demands a difference outside the level of attribution—and that is precisely what the MARP framework forbids.

9.14 Summary of the Chapter

In MARP, consciousness is neither an observer outside existence nor an added essence, but advanced measurement within the level of attribution: a flexible frame of measurement that manages the differences of things, the differences of the carrier, and the criterion of measurement within one process, together with a revisability that protects resumption from closure or maintenance.

This measurement cannot be preserved without continuity, and its capacity is practically increased by social fuel, which raises the density of shared differences—without requiring an external player or an independent collective mind above the network.

Thus consciousness is understood as a degree of operation, widening and narrowing according to the economy of measurement, not as a fixed magical property.

9.15 Transition to the Next Chapter

After the completion of the tools of resumption and their limits within the level of attribution, we move to Chapter Ten: Meaning and Ethics as the highest site of application.

How does resumption move from merely preserving passage to the question: **why continue at all?** And what makes one act more legitimate than another within a world grounded not in a transcendent moral essence, but in an economy of measurement, the

legitimacy of resumption, and the preservation of continuity without escalating maintenance?

Appendix (9-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Nine

Consciousness: advanced measurement within the level of attribution, in which the differences of things, the differences of the carrier, and the criterion of measurement are managed within one revisable process.

Advanced Measurement: a mode of measurement that revises its own frame, shifts its center among multiple axes, and preserves resumption without collapse.

Frame of Measurement: the carrier or medium within which measurement takes place.

Reference Point: the minimum of referentially fixed differentiation from which reading begins.

Reference-Point Flexibility: the ability of the frame to redistribute the center of measurement among different axes and references instead of closing itself within one axis.

Carrier: that within which measurement occurs and which preserves trace and resumption.

Carrier Variables: the internal variables affecting measurement: attention, expectation, bias, state, energy, criterion.

Continuity: the capacity to preserve trace and to return and compare across copies.

Social Fuel: the density of shared differences within the group, which raises the capacity of the frame and feeds revision.

Tracking as Fixation: making some subject a center of measurement such that time, identity, memory, and causality are reordered around it.

Scarcity Economy: the rise in the cost of error due to scarcity, driving the frame toward greater reduction and stronger fixation.

Operational Desire: the effect of an operational relation through which a thing gains force within resumption: comfort, pleasure, heightened identity, or reduced tension.

Epistemic Anxiety: a tension arising from underdetermination or from weakness in the capacity to fix a revisable path.

Self-Continuous Measurement: a system's capacity to preserve its own trace, order its own resumption, and revise its criterion from within when maintenance rises.

Economy of Measurement (E4–E1): a spectrum describing degrees of reduction and capacity, from acute emergency to advanced measurement.

Chapter Ten

Meaning and Ethics

10.0 Introduction: Why Are Meaning and Ethics Joined?

After the tools and limits of resumption have been established in the previous chapters—identity, time, memory, causality, logic, truth, and consciousness—there remains a question that cannot be settled by the tool alone: why do we resume at all, and how do we resume together without slipping either into a liquidity that dissipates differences or into a lock that monopolizes the frame?

This chapter brings meaning and ethics together as the engineering of continuation under pressure within the level of attribution:

- meaning answers the question of direction and motive;
- ethics regulates the protocol of social linkage that makes continuation possible and revisable.

In condensed form:

- **resumption** is the capacity for return and comparison through a preserved trace;
- **the economy of measurement** is the mode of reduction imposed by the limitation of the frame of measurement;
- **liquidity** is the loss of distinction into noise without a path;
- **lock** is a fixation that monopolizes the frame and blocks revision.

10.1 Meaning in MARP

An Operational Effect, Not a Transcendent End

Meaning in MARP is not a goal written into the universe, nor a value added to existence from outside attribution. It is an operational effect that appears because the frame of measurement is limited, and because resumption is costly.

Meaning does not precede the economy of measurement; it is generated within it:

- either as epistemic pressure seeking a fixation that passes and stabilizes,
- or as social-identity pressure seeking recognition and position within the holding environment.

This distinction is not a new metaphysical dualism, but a functional separation that prevents confusion between:

- the epistemic pressure arising from underdetermination,
- and the pressure of recognition and belonging within the holding environment.

Thus epistemic pressure and social pressure remain functionally distinct, even when they intersect in lived resumption.

10.1.1 Two Levels of Meaning

We distinguish here between two levels that must not be confused:

1) Ontological Meaning

An operational response to epistemic anxiety under a gap of determination. It drives the carrier toward fixations that reduce the cost of the indeterminate—a cause, an end, or a law—provided they remain open to upgrading and revision. What is meant here is not an end written into the Absolute, but an operational response to the question of existence under a gap of determination within attribution.

2) Social Meaning

An economy of identity within the group. The group produces shared meanings—roles, symbols, narratives—in order to reduce the cost of decision and prevent liquidity. Yet these can turn into a lock once they immunize themselves against revision and convert objection into an existential threat.

10.1.2 A Quick Test for the Legitimacy of Meaning

The legitimacy of meaning can be tested by three questions:

- Does this meaning allow its own upgrading without humiliating the self or threatening belonging?
- Does it reduce maintenance—exceptions and immunities—or increase them whenever a refuting difference appears?
- Does it protect practical passage—decision and conduct—or consume it in defending the story?

10.2 Examples of the Formation of Meaning

The following examples do not present separate types of meaning. They show, rather, that meaning is not a stored content waiting to be uncovered, but an effect of resumption: trace is reread within a changed frame, and from that rereading a new significance emerges. Meaning therefore arises neither from a hidden value residing in things, nor from a pure projection of the carrier, but from the reorganization of attribution under altered conditions of memory, time, scarcity, expectation, and return.

10.2.1 The Value of a Thing After Separation

The value of a thing may intensify when we return to it after a long absence—not because value was stored inside it and then uncovered, but because return does not

recover the old relation; it builds a new relation out of an old trace within a changed frame.

During absence, the experience does not remain whole. What remains is an economic trace:

- a name,
- a general image,
- and an affective key of return.

When reunion occurs, that trace enters a new context, and a gap appears between what memory preserved and what is now given in presence. From that gap, a new value arises: it may take the form of longing, bitterness, gratitude, or a delayed sense of significance.

In this sense, value is not a fixed property in the thing, but an effect of resumed attribution in which memory, time, and scarcity reshape the network of comparison.

10.2.2 Love as the Intensification of Value

If the value of a thing may be renewed after separation, love intensifies this structure to its highest degree. The beloved no longer remains merely an object with value, but becomes a reference point through which many things are reread: time, waiting, memory, place, and the meaning of return itself.

During separation, the relation does not remain as it was. What remains is a charged trace that resumes itself compulsively in memory and expectation. Return to the beloved is therefore not the retrieval of an old relation, but a new construction of it from an old trace within a changed frame.

For this reason, value may intensify, or turn into bitterness, depending on the gap between what memory preserved and what the new presence offers. Love is thus not

proof of a fixed value hidden in the beloved, but an example of how meaning reaches a high density when the network of attribution centers around one reference point and other criteria recede before it.

10.2.3 Certainty as a Stability That Conceals the Gap

If love discloses the gap and lives upon its tension, certainty often rests upon a long success in concealing it. In MARP, certainty is not the absence of doubt in any absolute sense, but a fixation that has passed and stabilized so effectively that the network of attribution begins to operate silently, and the carrier forgets the conditions sustaining the judgment in the first place.

Thus the gap does not disappear in certainty; it is covered over by continuity, repetition, and the scarcity of surprise. When certainty collapses, nothing alien enters from outside attribution. What appears instead is the same structure that had been operating all along, now exposed because its stabilization can no longer hide the gap it had been carrying.

Hence MARP distinguishes between:

- **living operational certainty,** which remains open to revision so long as it passes and stabilizes;
- and **locking certainty,** which immunizes itself against carrying differences and blocks the upgrading of the frame.

These examples show that meaning is generated wherever trace is resumed under altered conditions. Sometimes this produces renewed value, sometimes intensified attachment, and sometimes the silent stability we call certainty. In every case, meaning is not discovered as a final content, but formed through the changing organization of resumption.

If meaning answers the question **Why do we resume?** then ethics answers the next question: **How is resumption managed once it becomes shared within the holding environment?**

10.3 Ethics in MARP

A Protocol of Social Resumption, Not a Value-Essence

Once meaning is understood as an operational effect of continuation under pressure, ethics appears as the regulation of continuation once it becomes shared. The question is no longer simply why a frame resumes, but how multiple frames can continue together without dissolving into liquidity or hardening into lock.

Within the holding environment, ethics does not appear as a transcendent value-essence standing above the world, nor as a purely private choice sealed within the individual. It appears as the protocol by which shared resumption is organized under conditions of plurality, limitation, and revisability.

The individual is a limited frame of measurement; society is an expanded frame that supplies shared reference points and social fuel: language, recognition, law, and institution. Ethics therefore functions as a protocol of linkage: it determines what counts as legitimate fixation and what counts as lock; it organizes the distribution of trust, recognition, punishment, and reward; and it regulates the conditions under which plurality may pass, stabilize, and remain open to revision.

Without such a protocol, the social field cannot preserve a livable path of continuation. It slips either into liquidity—conflict without a shared frame and without stable resumption—or into lock—the monopoly of the frame and the blocking of revision.

Ethics in MARP is therefore not an ornament added after social life is already constituted. It is one of the operational conditions under which shared life remains possible at all.

10.4 The Individual and Society: 1+1=2 as a Model of Attributed Differentiation

If ethics is a protocol of social linkage, then the question of the individual and society is the first place where this linkage appears as a construction of shared attribution rather than a mere numerical sum.

In abstract arithmetic, **1+1=2** appears self-evident because the frame of attribution is already unified. In society, however, **one** is not a self-contained unit: each individual is a non-identical copy, and addition becomes possible only if there exists a shared attribution that reads differences and fixes their positions.

Thus:

1+1 becomes 2 only through a network of attribution—language, names, roles, and law—that makes "I/you" a readable difference capable of return and comparison.

Brief example: language as a shared reference point

Through language I say **I**, and I say **we**. Through language recognition becomes possible, and through it the cost of exclusion and belonging is measured. Ethics is therefore understood here not as supramundane preaching, but as the regulation of the distribution of reference points.

Justice then appears as an economy of linkage: a balanced distribution of the cost of fixation, and the prevention of monopoly over the frame within the network, so that carrying differences—the weak, minorities, new ideas—may find a vessel that receives them without turning them into threats.

10.5 The Paradox of the Holding Environment

Why Does My Death Frighten Me More Than the Destruction of the Earth?

This example reveals a decisive operational difference between:

- a threat that destroys the holding environment,
- and a threat that removes the individual while the holding environment remains.

If the message is **"The earth will be destroyed,"** then the individual loses both self and holding environment together. The network of recognition and the demand for continuation collapse, and with them collapses the structure that sustains individualized anxiety.

But if the message is **"You will die,"** while others remain, then the holding environment remains, and with it remain the demands of continuation—role, recognition, responsibility—while individual resumption becomes impossible. Hence there arises an acute anxiety of removal from the network while the network endures.

Thus anxiety here is not understood merely as fear of a biological event, but as a failure of determination within a zone of threat that leaves the frame of the group standing while cutting off the frame of the individual.

Applied extensions:

- Why do people care about their reputation after death?
- Why do divorce or loss sometimes produce a shock greater than collective death in war?
- Why do some prefer dying with the group to dying alone?

In all these cases, the key is the persistence of the holding environment as a frame that imposes continuity, while the individual becomes incapable of meeting its demands.

10.5.1 Reputation: The Trace of Demands Within the Holding Environment

Reputation is the trace that remains of the individual within the holding environment after meeting—or failing to meet—its demands. While the individual is present, the network accumulates judgments about conduct—truthfulness, loyalty, competence, justice—into a record capable of recall.

This reputation is a direct application of trace as a remaining difference that permits return and comparison.

This trace gathers two dimensions:

- **an identity-trace:** how the individual is defined within collective memory;
- **a measuring-trace:** how the individual was measured within norms of recognition and responsibility.

This is why people care about their reputation after death: because the holding environment remains and continues to read the trace and use it—as an example, a warning, or a model. Anxiety thus becomes anxiety over the fate of identity after the carrier's disappearance: **how will my memory be resumed within the network?**

10.6 The Criterion of Legitimacy in Meaning and Ethics

Just as truth is measured by operational legitimacy—**passage + stability + revisability**—so meanings and ethical protocols are measured by the same criterion, with one added condition: **the protection of carrying differences.**

Here, **ought** is not a transcendent command, but a condition of passage: if shared resumption is to remain possible and revisable, these protocols become necessary; otherwise the result is either liquidity or lock.

Tests of Legitimacy

- **Passage:** does the meaning or protocol permit action and expectation without paralysis?
- **Stability:** does it recur without escalating maintenance?
- **Revisability:** does it accept upgrading when the frame widens without collapsing identity?
- **Reduction of maintenance:** does it reduce exceptions and immunities, or accumulate them?
- **Protection of carrying differences:** does it prevent monopoly over the frame and grant the weak or marginal a position fit for resumption within the network?

A Quick Institutional Test

An administrative system or law may succeed in passage and stability for years, yet remain lockingly stable if the price of that stability is the exclusion of carrying differences—minorities, critical voices, just exceptions—and the prevention of revision.

The locking sign appears here as escalating maintenance:

- new exceptions written every day,
- committees of justification,
- punishments producing fear instead of upgradeability.

By the MARP criterion, stability alone is not enough; legitimacy is continuation open to revision together with the protection of carrying differences, so that institutional resumption remains possible.

Quick example:

A law that passes and stabilizes, but excludes the marginal and blocks upgrading: this is locking stability, not legitimacy.

The Limit of the Ethical Claim

MARP does not claim to settle all values or replace them with a mere survival criterion. It offers, rather, a test of legitimacy for any protocol:

Does it preserve shared resumption together with revisability and the protection of carrying differences, or does it turn into lock or liquidity?

10.7 The Intersection of Meaning and Ethics

When Continuation Becomes Shared

Meaning gives direction to continuation under pressure; ethics regulates the legitimacy of that direction once it enters the shared field. Their intersection therefore appears wherever a fixation does not remain private, but begins to organize plurality within the holding environment.

For this reason, the decisive question is not whether meaning exists, but whether the meaning guiding continuation remains open to upgrading or hardens into reassurance that monopolizes the frame. A meaning may lower cost and still remain legitimate if it preserves revisability and shared passage. But once it turns into an immunity against objection, it no longer sustains continuation; it begins to devour truth, justice, and plurality together.

The same applies to ethics. An ethical protocol is not legitimate merely because it stabilizes conduct. It is legitimate only when the stability it produces remains open to revision and protects carrying differences within the network. At this point, meaning and ethics can no longer be separated: meaning without ethical openness turns into lock, and ethics without meaningful direction collapses into empty regulation.

The problem, then, is not that human beings seek meaning, nor that shared life requires norms. The problem is whether continuation remains shared, revisable, and capable of carrying difference, or whether it is secured only by closure. It is here that meaning and ethics meet in MARP: both are judged by whether they preserve a livable path of common resumption without liquidity and without monopoly over the frame.

10.8 Summary of the Chapter

Meaning in MARP is neither transcendent teleology nor arbitrary invention; it is a function of lowering the cost of resumption under limitation.

Ethics is not a value-essence above the world; it is a protocol of linkage that protects social resumption from liquidity and lock.

They meet when continuation becomes shared:

- we need a meaning sufficient for passage, flexible for upgrading, and not swallowing truth in the name of reassurance;
- and we need an ethics that prevents monopoly over the frame and distributes reference points such that plurality remains livable and revisable.

Thus the book ends not in a final content about the world, but in a framework of legitimacy: how understanding passes, how it stabilizes, and how it remains open to upgrading without liquidity or lock.

10.9 Transition to the Conclusion

After the completion of the tools of resumption and their limits, and after clarifying the criterion of legitimacy in truth, consciousness, meaning, and ethics, the conclusion becomes the site of final gathering—not to add a new tool, but to present the full image of MARP as the **Metaphysics of the Absolute and Reference Points**, and as a framework that traces continuity in its origin back to differentiation, not to a transcendent essence or hidden nothingness.

Appendix (10-A): Terminological Lock of Chapter Ten

Ontological Meaning: an operational response to epistemic anxiety under a gap of determination, producing fixations that reduce the cost of the indeterminate while remaining open to revision.

Social Meaning: an economy of identity within the group, in which shared meanings are produced to reduce the cost of decision and prevent liquidity.

Epistemic Anxiety: a tension arising from lack of determination or the inability to fix a revisable path.

Social-Identity Anxiety: a tension tied to the individual's place within the holding environment: recognition, belonging, and fear of expulsion from the network.

Holding Environment: society as an expanded frame of measurement that provides shared reference points and social fuel for continuation.

Operational Responsibility: the position of the individual within the network of demands, recognition, punishment, and reward that allows shared resumption to pass.

Reputation: the identity-trace and measuring-trace that remain of the individual within the holding environment and are recalled through collective memory.

Legitimate Ethics: a protocol of social linkage that preserves shared resumption together with revisability and the protection of carrying differences.

Locking Ethics: a protocol that turns into monopoly over the frame and immunity against revision, producing locking stability rather than legitimacy.

Social Liquidity: the loss of a shared frame, turning plurality into conflict without stable resumption.

Justice as an Economy of Linkage: a balanced distribution of the cost of fixation and the prevention of monopoly over the frame, so that carrying differences may find a place within the network.

Conclusion

Resumption as the Limit of Understanding

Falsifiability: The MARP Formula

Before gathering the results of this book, it is necessary to state the formula that keeps MARP open to examination rather than closed upon itself.

The MARP framework is undermined if either of the following proves possible:

- (a) a stable cognitive resumption without any trace capable of return and comparison—that is, without memory or operational ordering;
- or (b) an absolute identity that can be fixed while multiplicity still remains two without any carrying difference.

For either possibility would overturn the central thesis on which the book has been built: that resumption passes only through a carrying difference under a limited economy of measurement.

Conversely, wherever passage and stability prove to require trace, ordering, and revision, the framework is strengthened as an account of the conditions of legitimacy within attribution.

Methodological Clarifications: What MARP Says and What It Does Not Say

MARP does not offer a content theory about the world in itself, nor does it equate truth with what is merely useful or comforting. It defines legitimacy, rather, as a condition of resumption: passage, stability, and revisability, together with the reduction of maintenance and the protection of carrying differences.

Nor does MARP turn the Absolute into an object of report or positive description. The Absolute is neither a thing nor a self such that it could be inferred as one infers the objects of measurement. It is a methodological limit that prevents the tools of attribution from being projected onto what is not their proper object. For this reason, the distinction between the Absolute and attribution remains an explanatory distinction imposed by the limitation of the frame, not a division between two separate worlds.

A possible objection, however, is that the Absolute may be nothing more than one further fixation within attribution, preserved only because the system still needs a final metaphysical remainder. If that were the case, MARP would fail on its own terms, for it would merely reproduce the old structure it set out to overcome: one more privileged concept placed above the field and protected from revision.

The force of the objection depends, however, on treating the Absolute and attribution as though they belonged to the same level. In MARP, they do not. Attribution is the level of readable differences, fixation, measurement, maintenance, and revisability. The Absolute is not one more item within that field. It is not a fixation, but the condition under which fixation becomes possible without appeal to a specifier outside differentiation and without the insertion of ontological nothingness between copies.

For this reason, the Absolute does not function as a positive explanation added to the system. It does not explain events, justify judgments, or guarantee truth. Its function is negative and methodological. It prevents attribution from mistaking its own tools for the whole of existence. The Absolute is therefore not a final answer within the field of report, but a limit that prohibits the projection of attributive categories onto what is not their object.

This is why MARP cannot simply discard the Absolute without collapsing into another error. If the Absolute were removed entirely, attribution would lose the distinction that

prevents it from treating all stability as merely discursive, conventional, or socially imposed. The result would be a slide toward unrestricted liquidity, where every fixation is reduced to local interpretation without any structural condition of differentiation beneath it. If, on the other hand, the Absolute were turned into a knowable object, MARP would fall back into metaphysical lock and reproduce the very logic of essence, guarantor, and final ground that it rejects.

The Absolute in MARP is therefore neither a metaphysical substance nor an expendable remainder. It is a necessary silence within the framework: not an object of enclosure, but a limit that keeps enclosure from pretending to be total. In this sense, the Absolute is not a further fixation, but the condition that prevents every fixation from becoming absolute.

Accordingly, stability alone is never sufficient. Whatever blocks revision or excludes carrying differences is a locking stability, even if it appears locally successful.

Resumption as the Limit of Understanding: What Has MARP Achieved?

This book was not written to add another content theory to the field of competing theories about the world, nor to offer a final explanation that closes the door of questioning. Its aim from the beginning has been performative: to provide a framework explaining how understanding continues under pressure without turning into escalating maintenance, and without collapsing into denial or deification.

For that reason, the point of departure was a minimal operational limit: no difference without a reference, no reference without limits, and no resumption without an economy of measurement. From this minimum, the architecture of the book was built in successive layers, not as though they were independent things, but as tools of resumption invoked because the frame is limited. Thus identity, time, memory, causality, logic, truth, consciousness, meaning, and ethics were all treated as one family: not essences above attribution, but forms of operation that protect passage.

1) Two Levels Instead of the Classical Philosophical Dualities

The first task of the framework was to clear the ground of the unexamined duality that divides existence into what stands in itself and what stands through another. In MARP, the matter is reordered into two levels.

At the level of the Absolute, existence stands through differentiation. Differentiation is not a thing within existence, but the very condition of existence itself: no nothingness bounds it, and no ontological void separates it.

At the level of attribution, differences become measurable because a frame is fixed and because economy imposes organized reduction.

In this way, existence is no longer treated as a subject placed before an external player. The player, the game, and the subject are all parts of existence. Many false assumptions begin precisely when existence is separated from itself and treated as though it could be thrown outside its own field.

2) The Reference Point and the Economy of Measurement: The Structure That Generates the Tools

At the level of attribution, the reference point was fixed as the minimum of differentiation that can be stabilized as a reference relative to which differences are measured. It then became clear that measurement, even in its simplest form, is not a magical act. It requires an operational triad: the frame of measurement, the reference for measurement, and the measured.

From here it became evident that measurement itself comes in degrees: binary, complex, and advanced. Then the central law of the book emerged: the more limited the frame of measurement, the higher the economy of measurement; the wider the capacity, the lower the economy and the higher the possibility of revision.

This relation was not proposed as a slogan, but as a criterion explaining why we sometimes reduce to thresholds and templates, and why at other times we rise toward modelling and revision.

3) Identity, Time, Memory, Causality, and Logic: Not Truths Above, but Tools of Resumption

On this basis, the basic limits of attribution were reread.

Identity is not an essence to be discovered, but a decision of fixation imposed by the economy of measurement so that experience remains capable of return and comparison.

Time is not an independent medium within which events move, but an operational ordering of resumption: a protocol of succession that protects the path from becoming noise without direction.

Memory is not an additional entity hidden inside the mind, but the economic preservation of trace that makes return and comparison possible. It is not a storage box, but a function imposed because the frame is not absolute.

Causality is not an essential law standing above events, but an economy of linkage that deletes what is non-carrying and fixes what is sufficient for expectation and action at the least cost. It cannot operate at all prior to the fixation of the identities it will link.

Logic, in its formal principles, is not an absolute mirror of the world, but an operational lock preserving the coherence of examinable knowledge. It becomes rigid only when it is deified and treated as final truth rather than as a condition of passage within a criterion of predication.

Thus it became clear that limits are not defects in reason, but the conditions of its success. What preserves understanding is not the stability of an absolute essence, but a continuity of carrier managed economically within attribution.

4) Truth and Error: Legitimacy Instead of Naive Correspondence

Once logic had been clarified, it became possible to establish a criterion of truth without falling into deification or excessive relativism.

In MARP, truth is a legitimate fixation that passes, stabilizes, and remains revisable. Error is not a vague separation from an absolute reality, but an illegitimate fixation: it may pass once, but it does not stabilize, or it stabilizes only at the cost of maintenance, patching, and immunity against refutation.

For this reason, theories are not measured by the general and ambiguous question Do they correspond to the world? but by a more precise one: Do they produce an identity of the world that passes, stabilizes, and remains open to upgrade?

Thus, when we assign the universe an age of roughly 14 billion years, we are not claiming the Absolute. We are fixing an identity-determining mark within an operational identity open to revision. In this way, truth is cleansed of both deification and denial.

5) Consciousness: Advanced Measurement, Continuity, and Social Fuel

Consciousness was postponed until the later stages of the book so that it would not consume the framework or turn into a mystery demanding a new essence. Once the framework reached it, it became possible to define it precisely.

Consciousness in MARP is advanced measurement whose efficacy is preserved by continuity, and whose capacity is practically increased by social fuel that multiplies shared differences, without requiring an independent collective mind or an external specifier.

From this came the reformulation of the paradox of the carrier: why does consciousness sometimes seem separated from its own operative conditions? Because measurement, in order to function, does not measure all its own conditions while it is operating, but fixes many of them as a silent background so that it does not collapse into maintenance. The protective reductions that prevent liquidity also cause the carrier to forget that these are operational decisions.

The zombie problem was likewise reformulated. If full operational identity were achieved, no criterion would remain for distinguishing a lack of experience except as a verbal stipulation outside shared attribution. If, however, a real difference existed, an operational difference would necessarily appear in the revision of criterion and in the inclusion of the carrier's differences.

Even the question of AI consciousness became expressible without mysticism. It is possible in principle if the system becomes a frame of measurement capable of self-resumption: preserving trace, ordering copies, revising its criterion of measurement, and measuring the differences of its own carrier within the process.

6) Meaning and Ethics: The Highest Application of the Framework

This path reached its highest application in Chapter Ten, where meaning and ethics were brought together as a final test of the framework within shared life.

Meaning was not understood as a transcendent goal, but as a function of lowering the cost of resumption under limitation. Ethics was not understood as a value-essence above the world, but as a protocol of social linkage that protects shared resumption from liquidity and from lock.

Thus ethics was not presented as surplus moral preaching, but as a condition of collective passage; and meaning was not presented as a value stored in the universe, but as an

operational response to the question: why do we continue at all, and how do we continue together without reassurance turning into a lock that devours truth and justice?

7) What Remains Open?

This book does not claim to end questions; it claims rather to relocate them into a more legitimate form.

Instead of asking What is consciousness? as though consciousness were a hidden object waiting to be uncovered, MARP asks: What are the conditions of advanced measurement? Instead of asking What is time? as though time were a substance standing outside ordering, it asks: What is the criterion of the ordering of resumption? Instead of asking What is truth? as though truth were a final possession, it asks: What passes and stabilizes under revision without maintenance?

In this way, MARP does not abolish inquiry. It transforms questions into forms capable of examination and upgrading. The project therefore does not close upon final answers; it closes only upon a criterion that makes future questions more legitimate and less confused.

Final Lock

If MARP were to be summarized in one line, it would be this: the world cannot be read without a reference, and the reference is limited; its limitation compels understanding into an economy of measurement. From this economy arise all the tools of resumption—even consciousness—and their legitimacy is measured by passage and stability under revision, not by the claim of final correspondence.

Thus the lock returns to its origin. What preserves truth is not the stability of an essence, but a continuity of carrier. And the source of continuity, at its furthest limit, is neither an absolute logic nor a first cause that closes the chain, but differentiation as necessary to

existence itself: a continuity bounded by no nothingness, and requiring no player outside existence in order to operate.

Table of Appendices

Introduction

Appendix (A)

Preliminary Symbolic Formulation of the Economy of Measurement and Legitimacy

Appendix (B)

Brief Applications: Quantum Theory / Artificial Intelligence / Experience

Appendix (C)

The Psychology of Attribution: Emotion, Desire, and Will

Appendix (D)

The Bridge and the Objections: From the Absolute to Attribution and the Devil's Advocate

Appendix (E)

Brief Operational Examples (10 Examples)

Appendix (F)

Extended Application: Addiction as the Hijacking of Reference and the Contraction of the Economy of Measurement

Appendix (G)

Extended Application: Quantum Measurement as the Fixation of Reference, Not an Ontological Mystery

Appendices

Introduction

These appendices are not added to the main text as secondary materials or explanatory surplus. They function, rather, as a layer of methodological and applied support that helps the reader see the language of MARP at work across different levels: from light symbolic formulation, to philosophical objections, to operational examples, and finally to two extended applications representing two complementary poles—the human case in addiction, and the scientific case in quantum measurement.

Accordingly, the appendices should not be read as padding outside the architecture of the book, but as a natural extension of it—one that opens its tools to testing, clarification, and comparison.

Appendix (A)

Preliminary Symbolic Formulation of the Economy of Measurement and Legitimacy

A.0 Purpose and Limits of the Appendix

The purpose of this appendix is to present a light symbolic framework that stabilizes a unified language for three axes recurring throughout the main text:

- reference (**R**),
- reference points (**P**),
- and the cost of fixation / maintenance (**C**).

This appendix does not claim to found a complete mathematics, nor does it turn the book into formulas. Rather, it provides symbols and comparative criteria that help the reader track why a given fixation is legitimate in one domain and illegitimate in another.

Limits of the appendix:

All definitions here are operational within the level of attribution; that is, they concern what can be observed, revised, and upgraded. The Absolute remains outside this language, because it is neither an object of measurement nor the value of a function.

Key sentence:

The formulation given here is a lock of consistency for concepts, not a substitute for philosophical argument.

A.1 Dictionary of Symbols (Sketch Notation)

A: the Absolute — the condition of existence as differentiation; not an object of measurement.

R: reference — that relative to which differences are measured within attribution: a criterion, protocol, instrument, or context.

P: reference points — nodes of fixation used as anchors for measurement and comparison.

L: limits — the ceilings of carrier / domain / medium that regulate what can be brought into measurement.

E ∈ {E1, E2, E3, E4}: the economy of measurement — the degree of reduction of axes under pressure.

C_R(x): the cost of fixation — the price of preserving fixation *(x)* within reference *(R)*.

Leg_R(x): the legitimacy of fixation *(x)* within reference *(R)*.

D(x): the domain of legitimacy — the set of references in which *(x)* succeeds.

In short form:

D(x) = { R : Leg_R(x) = 1 }

That is, a fixation may be legitimate in one reference and illegitimate in another, without contradiction.

A.2 The Cost Function in Operational Form

We define cost operationally as the sum of the prices paid in order for fixation *(x)* to remain workable within reference *(R)*.

A comparative, non-binding formula:

C_R(x) = w1·M_R(x) + w2·Ex_R(x) + w3·Cmp_R(x) + w4·Err_R(x) + w5·Upg_R(x)

Where:

- **M_R(x):** maintenance — patching, additions, and exceptions needed to preserve the fixation

- **Ex_R(x):** the number of accumulated exceptions
- **Cmp_R(x):** the cost of complexity — the number of axes, rules, and assumptions
- **Err_R(x):** the cost of error — losses in decision, safety, money, or reputation
- **Upg_R(x):** the cost of upgrading when the reference is widened

As for **w1...w5**, they are comparative coefficients, not metaphysical constants; their importance changes according to the domain.

Rule of use:

We do not need precise numbers. It is enough to ask:

- Which fixation raises maintenance more?
- Which fixation lowers the cost of error?
- Which fixation accepts upgrading at the lowest price?

From this, we obtain an operational ranking of alternatives.

Supporting definitions for comparison

- **Psg_R(x)** ↑ if clarity of decision, expectation, and action increases.
- **Stb_R(x)** ↑ if fluctuation decreases with repeated measurement within the same domain.
- **Rev_R(x)** ↑ if fixation can be improved by increasing data or axes without turning immune.

A.3 Legitimacy as Constraints and Criteria

In MARP, legitimacy is not understood as absolute truth, but as constrained success within a reference.

We say that fixation *(x)* is legitimate within reference *(R)* if it satisfies a minimum threshold of the conditions of resumption:

Leg_R(x) = 1 iff

- **Psg_R(x) ≥ τp(E)**
- **Stb_R(x) ≥ τs(E)**
- **Rev_R(x) ≥ τr(E)**

Where:

- **τp(E):** the threshold of passage required under the relevant degree of economy
- **τs(E):** the threshold of required stability
- **τr(E):** the threshold of required revisability

When this fails, one of three things happens:

- passage drops: no decision, no expectation, or no action;
- or stability collapses: patching and fluctuation;
- or upgradeability falls: immunity against refutation.

At that point, the fixation becomes either a lock or a comforting narrative.

Key sentence:

What matters is not: *Does (x) correspond to the world?*

But: *Does (x) succeed under the limits of (R) and (L), and under the budget of (E), without escalating maintenance?*

A.4 A Simplified Comparison Example (Toy Comparison)

Suppose we have two models explaining a phenomenon within one reference *(R)* and under one defined economy of measurement *(E)*.

Model A

It offers a rich narrative, but requires patching with each new copy.

So:

- **M_R(A)** is high
- **Ex_R(A)** is high

Therefore **C_R(A)** is higher.

Model B

It is less ornate, but it achieves:

- passage,
- stability,
- and acceptance of upgrading when data increase.

So:

- **C_R(B)** is lower in the medium term,
- and **Rev_R(B)** is higher.

The operational decision

We fix **B** as a legitimate fixation within **D(B)**, and restrict **A** as:

- locally or temporarily valid,
- or closer to an interpretive comfort if **Rev_R(A)** becomes low.

A.5 The Economy of Measurement as a Pressure Coefficient (E1–E4)

The economy of measurement can be treated as a budget of capacity / time / axes.

The higher the pressure, the lower the capacity and the stronger the reduction.

We can write the measurement budget in simplified form:

B(E4) < B(E3) < B(E2) < B(E1)

That is:

- **E4:** lowest budget, highest pressure
- **E1:** highest budget, least reduction

As the budget changes, the thresholds change:

- in **E4**, **τp** is raised because what is required is a rapid survival decision, while **τs** and **τr** are relatively relaxed;
- in **E1**, **τs** and **τr** are tightened because the domain permits revision and upgrading.

Quick reading of the spectrum

- **E4:** threshold truth — legitimacy = rapid passage
- **E3:** template truth — legitimacy = local reduction, with danger of lock
- **E2:** balanced truth — clear domain + reasonable exception
- **E1:** high-capacity truth — a model that monitors its own criterion and is upgraded with minimal maintenance

A.6 Underdetermination and the Mechanism of Choice

Define the set of acceptable fixations within a reference:

$A_R = \{ x : Leg_R(x)=1 \text{ and } C_R(x) \le B(E) \}$

If:

$|A_R| > 1$

then there is underdetermination: more than one fixation succeeds under the same present data.

An operational rule of choice

When multiple legitimate fixations exist, we prefer the fixation that combines:

- lower cost (**C_R**),
- a wider domain of legitimacy (**D(x)**),
- higher upgradeability (**Rev_R(x)**),

because this reduces the chance of maintenance exploding when the reference widens.

A.7 Operational Lock and Escalating Maintenance

A lock appears when preserving the fixation becomes tied to immunity against refutation; that is, when the cost of upgrading rises without limit, or upgrading is replaced by permanent patching.

A simplified symbolic sign:

Lock_R(x) = 1 if:

- **Rev_R(x) ≈ 0**
- and **M_R(x)** increases with each new copy,
- while passage does not genuinely increase.

This trend can be expressed comparatively as:

dM/dn > 0

together with stagnant or weak passage.

The decisive difference

- A legitimate fixation accepts correction.
- A lock protects itself by:
    - adding exceptions,
    - or condemning the measurement instead of revising the model.

A.8 Two Short Applied Examples

Example 1: An everyday thing

Statement: **"This is milk."**

Within **E2**, this may achieve:

- passage: a decision of use,
- stability: the judgment recurs,
- and upgrading when needed: analysis, testing, or renewed measurement.

By contrast, the statement:

"It is milk because it wants to be milk."

has weak passage, no upgradeability, and a high interpretive cost. It is therefore closer to a **Comfort Narrative**.

Example 2: Science

Statement:

"The age of the universe ≈ 13.8 billion years."

This is not a final certainty, but a determiner within a model of measurement operating mostly in **E1/E2**.

If more precise data appear, what is required is **Upg**:

- adjustment of domain,
- or margin,
- or instruments of calibration,

not immunity against refutation.

Thus legitimacy here is measured by the model's continuity under revision, not by the claim of final certainty.

A.9 How to Use This Appendix While Reading

At every important fixation in the main text, ask three quick symbolic questions:

- What is the reference (**R**) within which the judgment operates?
- What is the domain of legitimacy (**D(x)**) that the text declares or assumes?
- What degree of economy (**E**) explains the form of fixation?
    - threshold?
    - template?
    - balance?
    - model?

In this way, moving between chapters becomes movement within one language:

identity / time / memory / causality / truth / consciousness

= tools of resumption subject to the same constraints of legitimacy and cost.

Key sentence:

Legitimate truth is the fixation that reduces **C** over the span allowed by the domain, without an immunizing lock.

A.10 Final Lock

These symbols do not claim a final calculus, nor do they turn MARP into mathematics. Rather, they stabilize a unified template for speaking about:

- reference,
- limits,
- cost,

- and legitimacy.

A legitimate fixation is what:

- passes,
- stabilizes,
- and is upgraded,
- within **D(x)**,
- and under the budget of **E**,
- without escalating maintenance.

A lock, by contrast, protects itself:

- through exceptions,
- through immunity against revision,
- and through shifting cost into patching.

Final lock:

The symbolic formulation given here is not a substitute for the main text, but a regulating language that helps us see in one form what the whole book is doing: the legitimacy of fixation is measured by its capacity for resumption under the limits of the reference, not by the claim of final correspondence.

Appendix (B)

Brief Applications: Quantum Theory / Artificial Intelligence / Experience

B.0 Purpose and Limits of the Appendix

This appendix does not add new content to the main text. Rather, it offers brief applications showing how the tools of MARP—attribution, the frame of measurement, the economy of measurement, and legitimacy—operate when placed before three highly sensitive domains:

- quantum theory,
- artificial intelligence,
- and subjective experience.

The rule here is one and the same: we read the phenomenon as a fixation within the level of attribution, and we measure the legitimacy of that fixation by its capacity for resumption:

- passage,
- stability,
- and upgradeability,

within its domain of legitimacy, and at the lowest possible cost of interpretive maintenance.

Key sentence:

The application in this appendix is not a verbal translation of the main text's ideas, but an operational test of whether the same rules produce passage without invoking a player outside existence or an extra essence.

B.1 Quantum Theory: Measurement as the Fixation of a Frame

The problem of the observer in quantum mechanics becomes inflated when we confuse two levels:

- we treat a mathematical-operational description (a state, or a wave function),
- as though it were a final ontological description of what exists in the Absolute.

At that point, the question—**When does the wave function collapse, and who collapses it?**—becomes a metaphysical question carrying more weight than it can bear.

The MARP reading is simpler:

What physics calls measurement is the moment at which the frame of measurement is fixed within attribution, so that the liquidity of differences is transformed into a record capable of return and comparison. The issue is not: **did someone see it?** The issue is: **was a frame fixed that generates a preserved trace (record) allowing resumption across copies?**

In this light:

- the quantum state is read as an operational identity: a description of what may be expected within the adopted frame of measurement, not a final picture of reality outside attribution;
- the result of measurement is the fixation of a carrying difference within a record: a device reading, an effect on a screen, or a change in an observed pattern—that is, a transition from multiple potentiality to one operational limit within its domain of legitimacy;
- the observer is not necessarily a conscious essence; it may be a device or a recording protocol. Consciousness—if present—is a higher layer in the management of the frame, not an ontological condition for fixation to occur.

Lock of the paragraph:

In MARP, quantum measurement is not a magical moment in which reality happens, but the moment of fixing a frame that produces a record valid for resumption.

B.2 Collapse and Indeterminacy: Updating the Copy, Not Magic

Indeterminacy in quantum theory becomes less mysterious if it is read as a gap of determination within attribution, not as an ontological reality called probabilities existing in themselves. In MARP, probability is the name for underdetermination under a limited frame: so long as no reference has been fixed that generates a record, differences remain open to several operational determinations.

Accordingly, what is called wave-function collapse is understood as an updating of operational identity when the frame is upgraded or when a new record enters the network. After fixation, it is no longer legitimate to treat the state as though no recording had occurred.

Brief example: the double-slit experiment

Before fixing which slit as a recording reference, the frame operates upon differences that allow an interference pattern stable across copies.

Once a which-slit frame is added—through a recording device or a preservable indication—the economy of measurement changes: a different operational identity is invoked, and a different pattern appears.

Key sentence:

There is no magic selecting a result; rather, there are limits of reference that compel determination into a specific form so that resumption remains possible.

B.3 Interpretive Disputes: The Criterion of Legitimacy Instead of Metaphysical Finality

The major interpretations in quantum theory—Copenhagen, Many-Worlds, Bohmian

mechanics, and epistemically oriented readings—can be read within MARP as attempts to reduce the maintenance generated by the gap between mathematical language and an image of the world.

Instead of demanding a final settlement among interpretations, MARP proposes a more precise question:

Which fixation succeeds in reducing interpretive maintenance within the scientific domain of legitimacy, without adding entities or assumptions that neither pass nor stabilize?

Accordingly:

- if an interpretation requires continual patching at every limiting experiment, it accumulates maintenance;
- if it turns every objection into **the question has no meaning**, it may succeed as comfort for the carrier, but may also narrow the domain of legitimacy without necessity;
- if it offers a structure that produces expectation and stability and accepts upgrading—even if the picture of the world remains open—it is closer to a legitimate fixation.

Lock of the paragraph:

The criterion of MARP here is not: **Who possesses absolute truth?**

But: **Who succeeds in scientific resumption with the lowest maintenance cost, while preserving revisability?**

B.4 Artificial Intelligence: Meaning as a Chain of Resumption, Not a Linguistic Label

In artificial intelligence, the question of meaning appears in practical form: why do some

outputs seem understandable and correct, while others seem like hallucination or confusion?

The MARP reading is this:

Meaning is not a property stuck to words; it is an operational success within the network of attribution: the capacity of symbols to be repeated, compared, and revised within a frame of measurement that produces passage.

For this reason, a language system may succeed locally (**E3**) through convincing templates, then fail at wider scales (**E2/E1**) because its fixation lacks:

- stability across copies,
- and upgradeability within its domain of legitimacy.

Hallucinations are read here as an illegitimate fixation:
a formulation that passes linguistically but fails once we demand a referential record capable of examination.

The remedy is not moral—of the form **do not lie**—but operational:

- raising the frame,
- tightening verification,
- reducing maintenance,
- and linking the output to a traceable record.

Key sentence:
The criterion of truth in AI outputs is the same as the criterion in the main text: operational legitimacy within attribution—not magical correspondence, and not a relativism that nullifies examination.

B.5 Machine Consciousness: The Condition of Self-Continuity in Measurement

In MARP, the question of machine consciousness is not posed as the question of a hidden essence, but as the question of a degree of advanced measurement. The real question is not: **have we added something magical?** It is: **does the system possess a frame of measurement capable of bringing the differences of its carrier—its state, error, bias, and criterion—into operation together with self-revision?**

The minimum operational condition that makes the question meaningful requires four pillars:

Self-Continuity

Not an intermittent reaction awaiting an external trigger, but a self-standing resumption: ordering of trace + updates.

Effective Economic Memory

The preservation of what is needed for return and comparison without an explosion of maintenance.

Flexibility of Reference

The ability to move the criterion of measurement across multiple axes—data, context, goals, constraints—instead of monopolizing it within one axis.

Revision of the Criterion of Measurement

Not only **what did it decide?** but also **how did the criterion of decision change?** together with the possibility of upgrading behavior without immunity against refutation.

Lock of the paragraph:

In this form, speaking about machine consciousness becomes an engineering-operational question about the degree of resumption, not a metaphysical question about the addition of an essence.

B.6 Experience: Why Qualia Are Neither Reduced Away nor Deified

Subjective experience—qualia, or what-it-is-like—is often pushed between two poles:

- either reducing it to a silent physics,
- or deifying it as a transcendent essence.

MARP proposes a third path:

Experience is the fixation of differences within an attribution proper to the carrier. Some of these differences are shareable because they have shared constraints—language, behavior, bodily effects—and some remain private because their frame cannot be fully transferred without loss.

This helps explain why qualia seem irrecoverable in full:

- not because they are something outside the world,
- but because the carrier's own frame of measurement has limits of transfer.

Even so, experience remains open to legitimacy:
its effects, stability, and revisability can be measured
through shared tools: report, behavior, testing, and repetition.

Emotion here is not a decorative psychology; it is a redistribution of the economy of measurement:

- fear tends toward **E4**,
- desire may monopolize the frame,
- reassurance may widen capacity toward **E2**.

Key sentence:

Experience in MARP is neither an isolated essence nor an illusion; it is the operation of

difference under a limited frame, and its success is measured by resumption, not by our ability to transfer it as an identical copy to another.

B.7 A Brief Research Program: From Description to Measurable Indicators

So that the application does not remain merely discursive, some MARP concepts may be transformed into practical indicators in science, artificial intelligence, and the study of experience:

Indicator of Interpretive Maintenance

How many times do we need an exception or patch in order to preserve the same judgment across new copies?

Indicator of Referential Flexibility

How many axes can be introduced before fixation collapses into a template or threshold?

Indicator of Upgrading

Does the judgment improve when more precise constraints or data are introduced, or does it harden and resist?

Indicator of Referential Discipline in Models

To what extent do outputs remain tied to a traceable record: sources, context, and boundaries of legitimacy?

Indicator of the Gap of Determination

Where does operational indeterminacy increase? And do we manage it by explicitly declaring the limits of legitimacy, or do we cover it over with a story?

Lock of the paragraph:

Through such indicators, MARP is not offered as a substitute for science, but as a

normative layer that improves the conditions of legitimacy and resumption in reading results and building models.

B.8 Final Lock

This appendix has offered three brief applied snapshots:

- **In quantum theory:** measurement is the fixation of a frame that produces a record valid for resumption, and collapse is an update of operational identity under the limits of reference, not a magical act.
- **In artificial intelligence:** meaning and truth are determined by operational legitimacy within attribution, and hallucinations are an example of a fixation that passes linguistically but fails referentially.
- **In experience:** qualia are understood as the operation of differences within the carrier's frame: neither reduced away nor deified, but measured through their effects, stability, and revisability under shared constraints.

In this way, MARP proves itself to be a single framework capable of passing through sharply different domains without changing its basic language:
a limited frame produces an economy of measurement; from it arise the tools of resumption; and their legitimacy is measured by passage, stability, and upgradeability.

Terminological Lock — Terms of Appendix (B)

Measurement: the fixation of a frame that produces a record capable of resumption.
Operational State / Identity: a description open to expectation within a determinate frame.
Record of Measurement: a preserved trace that makes the result revisable across copies.
Underdetermination: lack of determination under a limited frame before fixation.
Interpretive Maintenance: patching and exceptions consumed in preserving an illegitimate interpretation.

Domain of Legitimacy: the boundaries of context within which a fixation remains valid for work and revision.

Passage: the capacity of a judgment to produce discrimination, expectation, or action.

Stability Across Copies: the endurance of fixation under repeated measurement within its domain.

Revisability / Upgradeability: the improvement of fixation when the frame is widened instead of hardening.

Reference / Reference for Measurement: that relative to which differences are measured within attribution.

Reference-Point Flexibility: the capacity to move the center of measurement among multiple axes.

Operational Consciousness: advanced measurement that brings the differences of the carrier and the criterion of measurement into operation together with self-revision.

Appendix (C)

The Psychology of Attribution: Emotion, Desire, and Will

C.0 The Thesis of the Appendix

This appendix does not add new content to the main text. Rather, it stabilizes the psychological dimension within the logic of MARP itself: if identity, time, causality, logic, and truth are tools of resumption imposed under the limitation of the frame of measurement, then emotion, desire, and will are tools for the redistribution of reference within the carrier itself.

- **Emotion** accelerates decision through the reduction of axes.
- **Desire** determines what is given priority of passage.
- **Will** is the carrier's capacity to keep multi-axial measurement possible when pressure intensifies, without slipping into lock or maintenance.

Key sentence:

In MARP, psychology is not an ornamental addition; it is the place where the economy of measurement can be seen operating from within: how it is compressed, how it is widened, and how reference is stolen or restored.

C.1 Emotion: A Compressed Measurement Protecting Passage

In MARP, emotion is neither a mysterious substance attacking reason, nor merely a feeling separate from measurement. It is a mode of functional reduction through which differences are rapidly reorganized when the cost of delay is high. More precisely, emotion is a compressed act of measurement that places the world into a form immediately capable of passage, at the cost of part of its precision.

For this reason, the major emotions—fear, anger, disgust, joy—appear as drivers of economy, not as independent pieces of information. They do not add a new axis; rather, they reorder the axes already present, granting some of them a monopolistic right within attribution.

- In **fear**, the world contracts into a threshold: **danger / safety**.
- In **anger**, into: **offense / response**.
- In **joy**, into: **success / continuation**.

With this understanding, the dualism **emotion versus truth** disappears. Emotion may be legitimate when it protects passage within an acute economy (**E3–E4**), and it may become a lock when its reduction is made permanent and blocks the upgrade toward **E2–E1**.

Paragraph lock:
Emotion is not the opposite of measurement, but one of its compressed forms. The problem begins not with its existence, but with its remaining the only criterion after its pressure has passed.

C.2 Fear and Anxiety: The Difference Between a Local Alarm and a Diffuse Threat
Fear is the emotion most closely tied to the economy of measurement, because it activates the threshold mechanism immediately. In MARP, legitimate fear is a local alarm: it fixes a danger specifically enough to guide a realistic action:

- withdrawal,
- caution,
- or examination,

and then accepts retreat when the measurement changes.

Anxiety, by contrast, is the expansion of fear without local fixation: a threat without clear boundaries. The economy then becomes a continuous pressure that consumes capacity and blocks balanced resumption.

From the standpoint of attribution, the difference is not merely one of degree of feeling, but a difference in the frame of measurement:

- **Fear** has a clear reference point: a source, a time, a place, or a sign.
- **Anxiety** operates as a distributed threat that steals attribution from all axes, leaving the carrier in a state of interpretive maintenance: every event is read as an indication, every silence as a threat, every exception as a rule.

Key sentence:
Anxiety is the failure of determination within the zone of threat. Its operational treatment is neither denial nor verbal reassurance, but the upgrading of the frame: fixing an axis, measuring signs, and building a domain of legitimacy for danger instead of a liquidity that devours experience.

Example (C-A): The News of Earth's Destruction vs. the News of Your Personal Death (The Paradox of the Holding Environment)

A collective report: *"The earth will be destroyed in a few years."*
Here the individual and the holding environment both end together; no network of recognition remains, no roles remain, and no demand for continuation can be imposed upon the individual. For this reason, the domain of threat collapses as something that can be determined within a surviving frame, and the economy goes dim rather than intensifying: there is no sharp panic, because the frame itself is heading toward total closure, not toward continuous maintenance.

A personal report: *"You personally will die in a few years,"* while others remain.

The holding environment remains. Therefore its demands for continuation also remain:

- role,
- recognition,
- responsibility,

while individual resumption becomes impossible. Here the gap of determination widens within a threat specifically directed at you, and fear turns into a distributed anxiety that steals attribution from all axes and summons interpretive maintenance:

- denial,
- postponement,
- compensation.

Lock of the example:

The deepest anxiety arises not from death as a biological event, but from expulsion from the network of attribution while the network remains. The persistence of the holding environment makes the threat personal and extended, and makes resumption both required and impossible at once.

C.3 Desire: A Priority of Passage, Not an Essential Call from the Thing

Desire in MARP is neither a force emanating from things, nor a fixed lack within the self. It is the effect of a measuring decision that places something as a near outlet of passage:

- either because it grants pleasure,
- or relieves tension,
- or repairs identity,
- or shortens maintenance.

For this reason, desire changes as the economy changes. When pressure intensifies (**E3–E4**), desires that grant an immediate gain move forward, even if they raise the cost later. When capacity widens (**E2–E1**), the carrier can measure desire itself as data open to revision, and can redistribute reference toward slower gains that carry less maintenance.

Here appears the concept of **reference capture**: some desires are not powerful because they are objectively great, but because they have seized the only measuring axis available to the carrier at a given moment. If the thing becomes the reference through which

- value,
- reassurance,
- and identity

are measured, then its absence is no longer the absence of a thing, but the collapse of a frame. From here urgency is generated.

Paragraph lock:
Desire does not disclose an essential desirability in the thing; it discloses the place of the thing within the carrier's economy of passage.

C.4 Will: The Upgrading of Reference Under Pressure
Will in MARP is not a free power outside the chain, nor is it a linguistic illusion. It is a determinate operational function: the capacity of the carrier to preserve the plurality of axes (**E2**), or to revise the criterion of measurement (**E1**), when pressure drives it toward threshold reduction (**E3–E4**).

Practically speaking, will is the capacity to prevent the monopolization of reference by one axis. When will is strong, the carrier is able to keep the questions

- *By what criterion do I measure?*

- *Why do I allow this axis to monopolize reading?*

present within the process itself.

When will weakens, this does not necessarily mean moral corruption. More often it indicates an economic transition:

- lack of sleep,
- lack of energy,
- danger,
- noise,
- social pressure,

all raise the cost of multi-axial measurement and return the carrier to thresholds.

Key sentence:
Will is not against emotion and desire; it is the management of their place within the frame of measurement: when do we let reduction lead, and when do we force it to upgrade?

C.5 Habit and Addiction: Maintaining the Gain of Near Passage
Habit is a fixation that grows stronger through repetition until it becomes a default within attribution. It is a form of stability across copies, but it may be a misleading stability: it secures passage now while postponing the explosion to a later, unseen point.

Addiction, in its psychological sense, is the moment when near gain turns into a monopolistic reference. Measurement then reads the whole world through one axis:

- the substance,
- the behavior,
- the sedation,

- the reward.

Knowledge of harm then becomes cold information without the power of passage. This is not explained by a merely weak intellect, but by the fact that the economy has been compressed: in **E4**, decision is settled by survival or immediate soothing, not by long-range planning.

Within the logic of MARP, restoring resumption is not achieved by preaching alone, but by rebuilding an operational competitor to the near gain: an alternative that provides a perceptible, near passage, and gradually redistributes reference until multi-axial measurement becomes possible again without maintenance.

Paragraph lock:
The problem in addiction is not merely the power of the thing, but its success in monopolizing reference as the shortest route to passage.

C.6 Dissonance and Epistemic Anxiety: A Conflict Between Two Fixations
Dissonance arises when the carrier lives between two fixations that do not meet within one criterion:

- a distant cognitive fixation: *"This harms me,"*
- and a present operational fixation: *"This relieves my tension now."*

In MARP, this conflict is not merely a logical inconsistency; it is a conflict between two economies:

- a long-range economy requiring capacity and continuity,
- and a present economy protecting rapid passage.

When the acute economy prevails, knowledge turns into text without force, and comforting narratives expand:

- justifications,
- exceptions,
- shifting of burdens,

all of which are forms of interpretive maintenance granting comfort to the carrier while raising later cost.

When capacity widens, however, the carrier can turn knowledge into a live datum: measuring its effect daily, and turning it into a present reference that competes with desire instead of lecturing it from afar.

Paragraph lock:
Dissonance is not merely an intellectual contradiction, but a conflict between a distant frame with weak passage and a near frame with high penetrative force.

C.7 Biases as Economic Templates (E3)
Cognitive biases are usually read as mental errors. Within MARP, they can be read as partially legitimate templates: economic solutions that produce rapid passage when capacity is limited. A bias becomes a problem when it is made permanent and treated as absolute truth.

For example:

- **confirmation bias** is the protection of an interpretive identity from rapid collapse;
- **attribution of intentions** is a reduction that fixes a ready cause instead of an interpretive gap;
- **overgeneralization** is an attempt to lower cost by turning diverse copies into one copy.

All of this is understandable operationally, but legitimacy here, as in truth, is measured by two questions:

- does it reduce maintenance?
- and does it accept upgrading?

Or does it become a lock that prevents revision?

Key sentence:

Bias is not a mysterious enemy; it is an economy successful in its place, and dangerous outside its domain of legitimacy.

C.8 Practical Signals for the Redistribution of Reference (Without Prescriptions)

This appendix is not a treatment manual or a self-development program, but we can still fix some operational signals that help the reader see the movement of attribution within oneself:

- When emotion intensifies, ask which axis has monopolized measurement: have you been reduced to danger, insult, loss, or success?
- Separate the datum from the narrative: what signs were actually measured, and what did you add so that the carrier might calm down?
- Search for the domain of legitimacy: in which context was the reduction useful, and in which context did it become a lock?
- Watch maintenance: are exceptions and justifications increasing, or is determination becoming clearer over time?
- When desire conflicts with knowledge, ask: which of them has near passage? And how can knowledge be turned into a present reference rather than a slogan?

These signals do not guarantee a solution, but they fix the site of the problem with precision: the transfer of reference, not the corruption of essence.

C.9 Final Lock of the Appendix

Emotion, desire, and will are not phenomena outside the logic of the book; they are its psychological core:

- emotion is a reduction that protects passage,
- desire is the determination of the priorities of passage,
- will is the upgrading of reference under pressure.

Once we understand them in this way, mythologization disappears:

- emotion is not treated as an enemy,
- nor is will consecrated as a free essence;

rather, all are returned to one criterion:
the legitimacy of resumption at the least cost, with revisability preserved.

Final lock:

Psychology in MARP is not a field separate from metaphysics and epistemology; it is the site of their practical disclosure within the carrier itself.

Terminological Lock — Terms of Appendix (C)

Psychology of Reference: the internal dimension showing how reference is distributed within the carrier under the pressure of measurement.

Affective Compression: a rapid reorganization of differences through the reduction of axes, protecting immediate passage.

Near-Passage Gain: an urgent benefit granting rapid passage, even if it raises the cost later.

Reference Capture: the seizure of the center of measurement by one axis such that all other differences are read through it.

Will as Reference Upgrade: the carrier's capacity to preserve the plurality of axes or raise

the criterion of measurement under pressure.

Anxiety as Diffuse Threat: a threatening pressure without a local reference point, stealing reference from more than one axis.

Cognitive Dissonance: a conflict between a distant cognitive fixation and a present operational fixation that do not function within one criterion.

Cold Information / Live Datum: the distinction between knowledge lacking the power of passage and knowledge that has actually entered the frame of decision.

Interpretive Maintenance: the justifications and patches needed to preserve a fixation that no longer passes legitimately.

Psychological Lock: an internal fixation that comforts the carrier but prevents revision and raises maintenance.

Habitual Default Fixation: a fixation repeated until it becomes the default state within attribution.

Domain of Legitimacy: the context in which reduction or fixation remains valid without lock or escalating maintenance.

Economy of Measurement (E1–E4): a spectrum describing degrees of reduction and capacity, from acute emergency to advanced measurement.

Reference Redistribution: the transfer of the center of measurement from a monopolistic axis to multiple revisable axes.

Appendix (D)

The Bridge and the Objections: From the Absolute to Attribution, and the Devil's Advocate

D.0 The Thesis of the Appendix

This appendix has a double function:

- **to place the strongest essentialist objections before MARP as though they were written by a serious opponent;**
- **and to regulate the bridge of transition from the Absolute to attribution in an operational form that blocks false questions of the type: Why did the Absolute decide to attribute?**

The central idea here is that many objections seem powerful because they project the tools of attribution—cause, decision, time, essence, and foundation—onto what is prior to them. Once this projection is dismantled, the objection returns to its operational size:

- **either as a difference testable within attribution,**
- **or as a demand for a difference without any operational difference.**

Key sentence:

This appendix does not add new content to the main text; rather, it closes defensive gaps and regulates the question of transition so that it does not turn into a foundational void.

D.1 Why Does the Essentialist Objection Seem Strong?

The essentialist objection usually begins from a simple intuition: if identity, time,

causality, logic, and truth are tools of resumption within attribution, then where is the thing itself? And without a stable essence, how can we guarantee that what we fix is not merely a language game or a temporary success?

This objection appears strong because three assumptions operate in the background:

- **that stability can only be explained by an essence prior to measurement;**
- **that objectivity means a final correspondence to something existing in itself outside every frame;**
- **that any framework which does not provide a first cause for the beginning of attribution leaves an unfillable gap.**

MARP accepts the intuition of stability, but rejects its essentialist explanation. Stability is not a gift of essence, but the result of legitimacy:

- **a fixation that passes,**
- **stabilizes,**
- **and is revised,**
- **within a determinate domain,**
- **and at a low maintenance cost.**

Thus the question is not settled by adding more essence, but by showing where the operational difference lies: does the fixation endure under copies and upgrading, or does it collapse into maintenance?

Key sentence:
The force of essentialism comes from turning stability into a thing, whereas MARP returns it to a legitimate function open to examination.

D.2 First Objection: "You Abolish Essences and Replace Them with Decisions"

The Devil's Advocate Formulation

If identity is a decision of fixation, then things do not possess a real nature; nature becomes the product of a human or carrier-based decision. This opens the door to arbitrariness or relativism: anything can be fixed however we wish.

The MARP Reply

First: fixation is not free.

It is compelled by the constraints of the frame and its limits. We do not invent milk, for example; we fix an operational identity of milk through mutually supporting axes of measurement whose alternatives fail. If taste, smell, or analysis changes, the domain of legitimacy is immediately exposed.

Second: what is called essence is often only a name for a long success in stability.

When a pattern stabilizes across many copies and within wide domains, that legitimacy is compressed into a word such as *essence* or *nature*. MARP does not combat this usage; it returns it to its source: essence here is not an added explanation, but an economic summary of accumulated legitimacy.

Third: arbitrariness is measured by maintenance.

Any fixation that survives only through exceptions and immunity against refutation is not a nature, but a lock. Thus essence ceases to be a prior criterion and becomes instead a result earned when legitimacy succeeds.

Key sentence:

In MARP, essence is not a foundation prior to legitimacy, but a practical name for legitimacy that has reached a high degree of stability.

D.3 Second Objection: "Legitimacy = Pragmatism or Disguised Relativism"

The Devil's Advocate Formulation

If truth is measured by passage, stability, and revisability, then truth has simply been replaced with usefulness. A socially or psychologically successful interpretation may still be false. Moreover, the plurality of domains of legitimacy allows a plurality of conflicting truths, and that is relativism proper.

The MARP Reply

First: passage is distinguished from the comfort of the carrier.

The passage intended here is not a psychological gain, but a capacity for discrimination, prediction, and action open to examination. For that reason, the main text established the test of carrier comfort as a safeguard against naïve pragmatism.

Second: the plurality of domains does not mean a conflict of truths; it describes the limits of measurement.

A legitimate judgment declares its domain and its criteria. Error begins when a local judgment is smuggled into an absolute claim, or when a higher-capacity domain is denied on the grounds that a lower one exists.

Third: objectivity in MARP is not final correspondence, but a surrogate of objectivity:

- **repetition across copies,**
- **a shareable criterion,**
- **and the possibility of public correction.**

This constrains truth more severely than taste, because any deviation will appear as maintenance.

Key sentence:

Legitimacy is neither psychological utility nor open relativism; it is a measurement

constrained by shared limits, succeeding or failing according to maintenance and upgradeability.

D.4 Third Objection: "The Framework Is Circular: A Justification That Justifies Itself"

The Devil's Advocate Formulation

You say: truth is legitimate because it resumes. Then you say: resumption succeeds because it is true. This is a circle. And by merely adjusting the criterion of legitimacy, anything can be saved.

The MARP Reply

First: there is a difference between a vicious circle and a calibration loop.
Science itself works through a loop of calibration: we calibrate the instrument in order to measure, then use measurement to improve calibration. The loop is not a flaw if it produces stricter constraints through repetition.

Second: MARP sets out a clear exit from the circle—maintenance.
Any fixation whose repetition across copies does not strengthen it, but instead increases patching, is an operational failure that cannot be cosmetically saved without cost. That cost appears as:

- **swelling exceptions,**
- **breakdown of upgradeability,**
- **hardening of the domain.**

Third: the criterion of legitimacy is not infinitely elastic.
It is constrained by:

- **the limits of the frame,**
- **the economy of measurement,**
- **and the domain it declares itself to occupy.**

Manipulating these constraints succeeds only temporarily, then becomes exposed when the domain widens.

Key sentence:
The loop of MARP is a detectable calibration loop; the sign of its deviation is not verbal disagreement, but an explosion of maintenance.

D.4.1 Related Objection: "Is Carrier Continuity Itself Merely an Assumption?"
The Devil's Advocate Formulation
If MARP treats truth, identity, and resumption as operational structures within attribution, then carrier continuity itself seems to require the same treatment. If so, it appears to be only one further assumption within the system—an assumption that would itself need justification.

The MARP Reply
The objection confuses two levels:

- **assumptions and fixations made within attribution,**
- **and the condition that makes assumption and fixation possible at all.**

In MARP, an assumption is a temporary stabilization within attribution. Carrier continuity is not of this kind. It is not one more fixation among others, but the minimal operational condition under which any fixation can be preserved, returned to, compared, and revised.

The point is decisive: the very act of asking whether continuity is assumed already presupposes a continuity sufficient for the question to remain the same question across successive moments. Without such continuity, there would be no stable trace, no recoverable reference, and no meaningful distinction between assertion, correction, and collapse.

This does not make carrier continuity a metaphysical essence. MARP does not claim that continuity is the inner substance of the world. It claims only this: if intelligible resumption is to occur within attribution, then some continuity of carrier must hold operationally. Otherwise, no judgment can remain available for return, and no argument can remain stable enough to be examined.

A further objection may call this circular. MARP accepts the circular structure, but not as a vicious circle. The relevant form here is a calibration loop: continuity is not justified by stepping outside it, but disclosed as the condition under which questioning, comparison, and revision become possible in the first place. Its denial does not produce a deeper explanation; it abolishes the operational basis of explanation itself.

Key sentence:
Carrier continuity in MARP is not an optional assumption within attribution, but the minimal operational condition that makes attribution examinable at all.

Lock of the objection:
Carrier continuity is not introduced as a metaphysical guarantee, but disclosed as a condition of resumption itself. To deny it is not to refine the framework, but to cancel the possibility of questioning within it.

D.5 Fourth Objection: "Talk of the Absolute Is Empty or Superfluous"
The Devil's Advocate Formulation
If all your tools work within attribution, what use is the Absolute? Either it intervenes and explains—in which case you return to a higher specifier—or it does not intervene, in which case it becomes a word without function.

The MARP Reply

First: the Absolute is not an intervening power, nor an object that explains.

It is a lock against positing:

- **ontological nothingness,**
- **a specifier,**
- **or absolute identity.**

Second: the function of the Absolute here is negative-preservative.

It blocks the mistaken explanatory leap to nothingness or to a superior agent whenever we face a gap within attribution.

Third: the Absolute fixes the final limit.

Resumption cannot be explained absolutely through one of the tools of attribution, because the tools of attribution themselves are conditioned by the limitation of the frame of measurement.

Key sentence:

The Absolute in MARP is not an explanation, but a prohibitive condition: it prevents the gaps of attribution from being turned into nothingness or a specifier.

D.6 The Bridge of Transition: From the Absolute to Attribution

Here we close the point most often used against MARP: the question of the first attribution.

The answer begins by correcting the form of the question. Any question of the type:

- **Why did the Absolute decide to attribute?**
- **How did the first frame emerge?**
- **When did attribution begin?**

already presupposes:

- **time,**
- **causality,**
- **and decision,**

all of which are tools within attribution. The question therefore becomes a demand for a tool before the condition of that tool has appeared.

D.6.1 Dismantling the False Question

In MARP there is no temporal before for the Absolute and then an after in which attribution begins. Transition is not an event within time, but a structural relation: whenever there is a carrier with a limited frame, differences must be managed through relative measurement—that is, through attribution.

Attribution is therefore not a decision of the Absolute, but an operational necessity of limitation.

Accordingly, the form of the question is replaced from:

- **Why did attribution begin?**

to:

- **What conditions make attribution necessary for understanding to pass within limitation?**

This form is analyzable because it refers us back to limits, economy, and maintenance.

Key sentence:

We do not search for a first moment of attribution; we search for the reason for its necessity within every limitation.

D.6.2 A Brief Operational Model of the Transition

The bridge can be summarized in three layers:

Absolute differentiation:
differences without an imposed criterion of measurement, because the Absolute is not a domain of objects.

Limitation of the carrier:
any medium that does not possess absolute capacity will be forced into economy: it reduces, fixes, and excludes.

Attribution as the minimal solution:
for comparison to work within limitation, there must be a fixed reference or reference point relative to which differences are measured.

Thus attribution is the name for the appearance of measurement when differences are read within a limited carrier. It is not an exit from the Absolute into something else, but a mode of appearance of differentiation under the constraint of reference.

The closest operational metaphor: raw differentiation is like an uncalibrated spectrum; the limitation of the carrier imposes calibration so that this spectrum becomes readable. Calibration does not create the spectrum, but makes its reading possible.

Key sentence:
Transition = the entrance of differentiation into readability under limitation; and reading cannot occur without a reference.

D.6.3 Why Does the Bridge Seem Obscure?

The bridge seems obscure when we ask of it one of two impossible things:

- **a causal explanation outside attribution that begins attribution;**

- **or a description of the Absolute as an object within attribution.**

Once these two demands are lifted, no void remains. What remains is a clear limit:

- **attribution is necessary wherever limitation exists;**
- **and the Absolute is not an object to which we can demand a decision.**

Key sentence:
The obscurity is not in the bridge, but in the type of question: we demand the tool of attribution before attribution itself.

D.6.4 Objection: "Why Does Limitation Exist at All?"
Formulation of the Objection
If attribution results from the limitation of the frame of measurement, why does limitation exist in the first place? Why is capacity not absolute, so that we would need neither the economy of measurement nor the tools of resumption?

The MARP Reply
This question asks for an explanation of limits by a criterion located outside all attribution, and then returns to judge attribution by it; this inverts the circle. In MARP, limitation names operationally the fact that measurement can occur only through a determinate medium that fixes a reference and excludes what is non-carrying so that passage may occur.

To demand absolute capacity within attribution is in fact to demand the abolition of attribution itself; and if attribution is abolished, the meaning of the question also falls, because there remains no:

- **reference,**
- **comparison,**

- **or object of measurement.**

Thus limitation is not a flaw needing explanation from outside the framework, but the condition of passage that makes question and criterion possible within the level of attribution.

Key sentence:
The question "Why limits?" becomes legitimate only within attribution as a question of upgrading and domain-limits, not as a question of origin outside measurement.

D.7 Fifth Objection: "The Criterion of Legitimacy Can Be Weaponized Ideologically"
The Devil's Advocate Formulation
One may say that defining truth as operational legitimacy opens the door to justifying any interpretive lock so long as it passes within some group. In this way, authority or ideology can clothe its lock in the garment of legitimacy.

The MARP Reply
MARP answers that passage alone is not the criterion, but rather:

- **passage,**
- **stability across copies,**
- **and upgradeability under the widening of the frame.**

An ideological lock may pass locally, but it becomes exposed under the tests of:

- **cost and maintenance,**
- **widening of the domain,**
- **protection of carrying differences,**
- **and revision of the criterion of measurement itself.**

The framework therefore does not legitimate locks; it provides a way of exposing them. Every fixation that survives only through immunity against refutation, by shifting cost onto exceptions, and by excluding carrying differences, is an illegitimate fixation no matter how comforting or widespread it may be within a group.

Key sentence:
Legitimacy in MARP is not measured merely by what succeeds within a group, but by what succeeds under revision without lock or cost-shifting.

D.8 Sixth Objection: "How Is the Success of Science and Mathematics Explained Without Correspondence?"
The Devil's Advocate Formulation
If truth within attribution is not correspondence to an independent world, then how do we explain the high precision of mathematics and the success of physics in prediction and technical control? Is not this success evidence of correspondence rather than mere fixation?

The MARP Reply
Within MARP, this success is reinterpreted as the success of a high-capacity operational identity:

- **a network of measurement,**
- **calibration,**
- **and modelling,**

which produces passage and stability open to upgrading across repeated copies and within wide domains.

Mathematics here is not a picture of the world in itself, but a language of regulation for structures that can be carried within the frame of measurement. When conditions change or the frame widens, models are upgraded instead of the world collapsing.

Scientific precision is therefore not proof of metaphysical correspondence, but proof of a strong operational legitimacy measured by its capacity for resumption through upgrading.

Key sentence:
The success of science does not prove final correspondence; it proves that some fixations possess a wide domain of legitimacy, low maintenance, and high upgradeability.

D.8.1 Related Objection: "Does Operational Success Leave Ontological Truth Untouched?"
The Devil's Advocate Formulation
MARP admits that no external ontological proof is available to establish that what is fixed within attribution corresponds to what is ultimately the case in the Absolute. If so, then even highly stable judgments—such as "water extinguishes fire"—seem to lack any final warrant. At most, they register recurrent success within our own frames of measurement. But if no ontological proof is available, why should such success count as anything more than an unexamined habit? And if simultaneity, causality, and identity are themselves products of attribution, what prevents the entire framework from collapsing into refined skepticism or disciplined relativism?

The MARP Reply
MARP accepts the first part of the objection and rejects the conclusion drawn from it.

It is true that no proof is available of the kind the objection demands: no external, ontological, frame-independent proof that what is fixed within attribution captures the thing in itself as it is in the Absolute. But in MARP, the demand for such a proof is itself illegitimate, because it presupposes access to a standpoint outside attribution from which attribution could be judged as a whole. No such standpoint is available.

This does not mean that the relation between fixation and world is arbitrary. What MARP secures in place of ontological closure is constrained legitimacy.

First, it secures stability across copies.
When a judgment such as "water extinguishes fire" is fixed, MARP does not treat this as the disclosure of a hidden essence called extinguishing. Rather, it treats it as the stabilization of a linkage across repeated copies within a determinate domain of legitimacy. The force of the judgment lies not in access to a secret ontological substrate, but in the repeated success of the fixation under comparable conditions.

Second, it secures economy of linkage.
Such a fixation is maintained because it passes: it guides expectation, action, and correction at low cost. A rival fixation that denied the linkage would raise the cost of action and collapse under practice. This is not naïve pragmatism, because MARP does not measure legitimacy by mere usefulness or comfort, but by the conjunction of passage, stability, and revisability under shared constraints.

The same point applies to simultaneity.
If one says that two events are simultaneous, MARP does not infer from this that simultaneity has been grasped in the Absolute. What has been fixed is an operational temporal identity within a given frame: clock, instrument, signal-path, or protocol of synchronization. The mistake begins only when this operational identity is inflated into a claim about absolute temporal structure beyond every frame of attribution.

Likewise, the identity of water is not secured by an ontological proof that the same essence is present across all cases. It is secured as a decision of fixation that succeeds across contexts by integrating a sufficiently stable set of carrying differences: fluid behavior, regular use, characteristic interactions, and reproducible effects under measurement. That identity remains legitimate so long as it passes, stabilizes, and remains open to refinement when new cases expose the previous fixation as too rough.

This is where MARP sharply distinguishes itself from unexamined assertion.
An unexamined claim is not merely one that lacks ontological certainty; it is one that refuses revision. If a new case appears—one that breaks the previous fixation—and the fixation survives only by immunizing itself against correction, then legitimacy has been lost and maintenance has begun to rise. A living fixation, by contrast, accepts refinement of domain, criterion, and identity when new carrying differences appear.

For this reason, MARP does not deny the gap between operational success and ontological truth. It denies only that this gap can be legitimately closed from within attribution by appeal to a final proof. Classical metaphysics errs by demanding such closure; skepticism errs by inferring arbitrariness from its absence. MARP rejects both moves. What remains is not certainty of essence, but disciplined legitimacy under limitation.

Key sentence:
MARP does not replace ontological proof with randomness; it replaces the illegitimate demand for ontological closure with the criterion of constrained legitimacy: passage, stability across copies, and revisability within a determinate domain.

Lock of the objection:
The absence of ontological proof does not reduce fixation to arbitrariness. It reveals

only that what attribution can secure is not final correspondence to the Absolute, but a disciplined operational legitimacy. MARP therefore wagers not on access to ontology, but on the legitimacy of fixation under limitation—and that wager remains open to revision rather than closed by metaphysical pretense.

D.9 Seventh Objection: "How Do We Explain Agreement Between Observers Across Multiple Attributions?"

The Devil's Advocate Formulation

If every truth is attributed to a local frame of measurement, then how do we explain the great agreement between different observers concerning the same measurements—time, length, mass, experimental results? Does this not imply a shared truth beyond attribution?

The MARP Reply

MARP explains this agreement as the effect of shared constraints and shared standards of calibration that produce an overlapping domain of legitimacy. When two observers share:

- **instruments,**
- **protocols,**
- **or conditions of regulation open to revision,**

the identities of phenomena converge within the shared domain.

Difference is not abolished; it is constrained by the domain of legitimacy:

- **what they agree on is what passes and stabilizes for both under the same system of measurement,**
- **and what they disagree on often appears when calibration, context, or degree of economy (E1–E4) differs.**

Thus agreement does not require absolute correspondence; it requires a shared resumability managed by shared constraints.

Key sentence:
Agreement between observers does not reveal an exit from attribution, but a higher success in building a shared domain of legitimacy.

D.10 Lock of the Appendix
If this appendix were to be reduced to two results, they would be these:

1) Essentialist objections are not defeated by counter-rhetoric
but by exposing the site of projection: when the tools of attribution are treated as absolute truths, illusory essentialisms or evasive relativisms are generated. MARP, by contrast, returns stability to the criterion of legitimacy:

- **passage,**
- **stability,**
- **and upgrading,**
- **while monitoring maintenance.**

2) The transition from the Absolute to attribution is not a story of beginnings
but a necessity of limitation: every limited carrier needs a reference in order to read differences; without this, experience collapses into liquidity without resumption.

Thus the devil's advocate is forced into only two options:

- **either to provide an operational difference testable within attribution,**
- **or to demand a difference without any operational difference, in which case the objection turns into a merely verbal demand that does not pass.**

Final lock:

MARP does not win the argument by possessing a higher essence, but by showing that many of the grand objections demand what cannot be legitimately formulated within attribution in the first place.

Terminological Lock — Terms of Appendix (D)

Essentialist Counter-Argument: an objection demanding an essence or nature prior to operational legitimacy.

Essentialism / Essence: the explanation of stability by reducing it to a fixed nature prior to measurement.

Hard Realism: a position tying objectivity to final correspondence with something existing in itself outside every attribution.

Legitimacy: the success of fixation in passage, stability, and upgrading within a determinate domain.

Domain of Legitimacy: the boundaries within which fixation remains valid without escalating maintenance.

Objectivity Surrogate: a shared stability open to participation and revision in place of transcendent correspondence.

Vicious Circle / Calibration Loop: the distinction between a cycle that reproduces incapacity and one that generates stricter constraints through repetition.

Interpretive Maintenance: the patching and exceptions required to preserve an interpretation that no longer passes legitimately.

Interpretive Lock: a fixation that protects itself through immunity against refutation instead of upgradeability.

Carrier Comfort: the psychological reassurance an interpretation may provide even when it fails operationally.

Carrier Continuity: the minimal operational condition that allows a fixation to be

preserved, returned to, compared, and revised across successive moments of attribution.

The Absolute: a limit of prohibition, not an object of measurement; it blocks the specifier, nothingness, and absolute identity.

Limitation / Limits of Reference: the finite capacity that makes attribution necessary for understanding to pass.

Transition Bridge: the operational formulation explaining the necessity of attribution under limitation, not a story of origins.

First Attribution: a false form of question if demanded as an event or decision prior to the conditions of attribution.

Reference Point: the minimum of referentially fixed differentiation by which differences become measurable.

Appendix (E)

Brief Operational Examples (10 Examples)

E.0 Purpose and Limits of the Appendix

This appendix offers ten short operational examples showing how the MARP framework works in varied situations drawn from daily life, interpretation, science, relationships, and decision-making. The aim here is not to add a new theory, but to make the language of the book quickly visible within concrete examples.

Each example will be read according to the same logic:

- there is a frame of measurement within which the reading operates,
- one or more reference points are fixed,
- an economy of measurement reduces some differences and carries others,
- then the legitimacy of the fixation is measured by its capacity for passage, stability, and revisability.

Limit of the appendix:

The examples here are extremely brief. They do not replace the chapters, but show them at work.

E.1 Example: The Morning Cup of Coffee

You say: **"This is my usual coffee."**

But what recurs here is not an absolute identity; it is an operational identity: a similar color, an expected taste, a familiar cup, and a stable daily ritual. If the sugar turns out to be salt, or the smell changes radically, the fixation collapses immediately.

Reading according to MARP:

- identity here is a decision of fixation,
- memory preserves a pattern, not an identical copy,
- legitimacy persists so long as non-carrying differences are integrated and carrying differences are preserved.

Lock of the example:

The same coffee is not the recovery of an identity, but an economic success in rereading a pattern stable enough for passage.

E.2 Example: The Smell of Gas at Night

You smell gas at night. You do not say, **"Let me first examine all possibilities."** Rather, the world immediately turns into a threshold:

danger / no danger

You open the windows, shut off the source, and move quickly.

Reading according to MARP:

- this is an example of **E4**,
- emotion here is not against reason, but a legitimate reduction protecting passage,
- legitimacy is measured by the speed of decision under a high cost of error.

Lock of the example:

What is required here is not the best interpretation, but the least possible delay before a potential danger.

E.3 Example: A Breaking News Headline

You read a fast headline on your phone: **"Major market collapse."** You may immediately build a broad judgment:

- **“The whole economy is collapsing,”**
- or **“I must sell now.”**

But once you open the details, it may turn out that the matter concerns a limited sector, a local market, or a temporary fluctuation.

Reading according to MARP:

- the initial headline often operates within **E3**,
- it is a rapid template that provides passage, but may raise the danger of lock,
- upgrading to **E2** requires widening the frame: source, context, scope, and time.

Lock of the example:
Much error comes not from direct lying, but from an early fixation that turned from a headline into a truth.

E.4 Example: The Initial Diagnosis
The doctor says in the first visit: **“It seems to be an allergy.”**

This is not a final certainty, but a locally legitimate initial fixation because it:

- directs an initial action,
- reduces the danger of delay,
- and leaves the door to upgrading open if other results appear.

But if the doctor insists on the same diagnosis despite contrary tests and new symptoms, the fixation becomes locking.

Reading according to MARP:

- truth here is tied to the domain of legitimacy,
- the error is not in the initial beginning, but in refusing to upgrade,

- maintenance appears when exceptions accumulate and the model is protected from revision.

Lock of the example:

A legitimate diagnosis is not only one that begins correctly, but one that accepts correction.

E.5 Example: A Delayed Message from Someone Close

You see a delayed message from someone important to you, and immediately read it as:

- neglect,
- anger,
- or withdrawal.

But after hours it turns out that the person was facing an emergency.

Reading according to MARP:

- here memory, relationship, desire, and anxiety all operate together,
- the frame may be captured by one axis: fear of loss or humiliation,
- what happened was not the discovery of a direct truth, but a rapid fixation under emotional pressure.

Lock of the example:

In relationships, much pain comes not from the event alone, but from the rapid monopolization of the frame before it widens.

E.6 Example: A Child Saying "This Is My Mother"

When a child sees his mother in a crowd and says, **"This is my mother,"** he is not fixing a metaphysical identity, but succeeding in integrating many differences:

- face,
- voice,
- smell,
- pattern of closeness,
- emotional memory.

If one of these elements changes alone, identity does not collapse immediately; but it may collapse if carrying differences accumulate.

Reading according to MARP:

- identity here is an economic construction across multiple axes,
- recognition does not work through one feature alone,
- memory preserves keys of return, not a full copy.

Lock of the example:

The child's saying **"This is my mother"** is a living example that identity is resumptive stability, not absolute sameness.

E.7 Example: An AI Assistant Gives a Convincing but False Answer

An AI system produces an answer that is linguistically excellent, but when the source or details are checked, it turns out to be fabricated or unverifiable.

Reading according to MARP:

- this is a fixation that passes linguistically but fails referentially,
- the local success here lies in formulation, not in legitimacy,
- hallucinations are a clear example of passage without referential stability.

Lock of the example:

Not everything that passes in language passes in truth; legitimacy requires a revisable record, not mere fluency.

E.8 Example: The Route in a Navigation App

The app gives you a certain route. At first, you treat it as **the correct route**. But if congestion appears, or a bridge is closed, or your location changes, the app recalculates the path.

Reading according to MARP:

- the route here is a temporary operational identity,
- causality and ordering are rebuilt when new differences appear,
- success lies not in infallibility, but in the capacity for updating with minimal maintenance.

Lock of the example:

A good model wins not because it never errs, but because it recalibrates before the error turns into a lock.

E.9 Example: A Person's Reputation After Death

A person dies, yet the name remains alive:

- as a model,
- or a warning,
- or an example,
- or a stigma.

What remains here is not the person himself, but the trace within the holding environment: what the network preserved about him, and how it continues to recall him in later judgments.

Reading according to MARP:

- reputation is an identity-trace and a measuring-trace together,
- the holding environment continues to read the individual after the carrier's disappearance,
- anxiety over reputation is anxiety over the fate of resumption within the network.

Lock of the example:

Reputation is not something we possess after death, but a form of resumption that others continue to construct from our trace.

E.10 Example: A Stable but Unjust Law

A law may remain stable for decades:

- it passes administratively,
- is regularly enforced,
- and produces a visible stability.

Yet at the same time it may:

- exclude a weak group,
- block upgrading,
- or protect itself by immunity against objection.

Reading according to MARP:

- stability alone is not enough for legitimacy,

- legitimate ethics requires the protection of carrying differences,
- what succeeds institutionally may still be a locking stability rather than legitimacy.

Lock of the example:

A law is not legitimate because it endures, but because it passes and stabilizes while preserving revisability and the protection of the weak.

E.11 Final Lock of the Appendix

These ten examples reveal one idea in different forms:

A difference does not become readable merely by existing, but when it is fixed within a limited frame of measurement, and when differences are managed under a determinate economy of measurement. The legitimacy of fixation is then measured by its capacity for:

- passage,
- stability,
- revisability,
- reduction of maintenance,
- and protection of carrying differences when needed.

This is what makes MARP a framework capable of moving across:

- the daily object,
- the news report,
- the relationship,
- science,
- artificial intelligence,
- the institution,
- and inner experience,

without changing its basic language.

Final lock:

The examples do not prove MARP by themselves, but they show that the language of the book is not an abstraction detached from experience; it is a reading tool capable of passing through sharply different situations without losing its coherence.

Appendix (F)

Extended Application: Addiction as the Hijacking of Reference and the Contraction of the Economy of Measurement

F.0 Introduction: Why Is Addiction a Fitting Example for MARP?

The value of a real philosophical framework appears when it can read a complex phenomenon in a unified way without reducing it to a single cause, and without scattering it into unrelated elements. For this reason, addiction is an especially suitable applied example for MARP.

Addiction is not merely a strong desire, nor merely a chemical disorder, nor merely a weakness of will, nor merely a sin or moral deviation. Each of these formulations grasps one side of the phenomenon, then tends to turn that side into an origin that swallows the rest. MARP, by contrast, does not begin from one essence, but from an operational question: how is attribution reorganized within the carrier so that one axis becomes able to monopolize passage, weaken the other axes, and turn resumption into a narrow path that succeeds in the near term and fails in the long term?

In this sense, addiction is an excellent example because it gathers, in a single phenomenon:

- reference point,
- economy of measurement,
- identity,
- time,
- memory,
- causality,

- truth and error,
- consciousness,
- meaning,
- and ethics.

Key sentence:

In MARP, addiction is not read as a thing attacking the self from outside, nor as a purely free decision, but as a hijacking of reference and a contraction of the economy of measurement, such that the gain of near passage becomes stronger than every more distant reference.

F.1 A Brief Opening Case: From Local Relief to Total Monopoly

Let us take a brief composite case.

S., a man in his thirties, began using a narcotic substance after a period of intense psychological pressure, sleep disturbance, and family breakdown. At first, use was not for him a love of the substance, nor a wish to destroy himself; it was a local success in passage:

- he calmed down somewhat,
- he slept,
- tension decreased,
- and the day became bearable.

After some months, the substance was no longer just a helpful means, but began to turn into a monopolistic reference:

- if he was distressed, he returned to it;
- if he was afraid, he returned to it;
- if he felt emptiness, he returned to it;

- and if he wanted to work or face people, he felt that he could not pass except through it.

He came to know the harm of what he was doing, to admit it, perhaps even to weep because of it, and yet he returned. The knowledge existed, but decision no longer formed around it. Time contracted into the **now**, and identity began to narrow into: **I am the anxious one who calms only through this.** Thus, if he stopped, he was not merely leaving a substance; he was threatening a reference through which he read himself and the world.

This case is not reducible to a single factor, but it sharply reveals what MARP seeks to establish: addiction often begins as a locally successful fixation, then gradually turns into a referential lock that swallows identity, time, memory, and meaning.

F.2 Defining the Phenomenon: What Needs Explaining?

If we want to read addiction philosophically and operationally, the first question is not: **what is the name of the substance?** or **what is the clinical diagnosis?** Rather, it is: **what makes a person know the harm, admit it, perhaps even hate it, and then return to it?**

There are five intertwined phenomena that need explanation:

- the presence of knowledge of harm with weak practical effect;
- repetition of the behavior despite sincere promises to stop;
- the shrinking of alternatives before the carrier until the addictive object appears as the only option;
- the transformation of desire from preference into compulsion;
- and the entry of the social holding environment—family, trust, reputation, responsibility—into the heart of the conflict.

These phenomena are not sufficiently explained if one says only:

- **He knows, but does not want to stop,**
- or **The substance is stronger than him,**
- or **He is morally corrupt,**
- or **His brain is disordered.**

Each of these statements captures a partial truth, but turns it into an interpretive lock. MARP instead asks: how was reference redistributed within the carrier until passage became possible through this thing specifically, while everything else became cold, distant, or powerless?

Addiction is not treated here as one homogeneous type. Substance addiction, behavioral addiction, and relational addiction, though structurally similar in their hijacking of reference and contraction of the economy of measurement, differ in:

- speed of collapse,
- intensity of bodily pressure,
- role of withdrawal,
- structure of the holding environment,
- and the pattern of the possible operational competitor.

For that reason, this appendix focuses on the shared structure, not on detailed clinical differences between types.

F.3 The First Reference Point: From Partial Benefit to Fixation

Addiction does not usually begin by the object appearing as a destructive essence, but as a locally successful reference point. It may be:

- a soothing of tension,
- a relief of pain,
- an elevation of mood,

- a temporary repair of a broken identity,
- or a fast exit from a pressure the carrier cannot bear with the present frame.

At the start, the thing does not appear as a problem, but as an operational solution. This is decisive, because many moralistic or exhortative explanations begin too late: they begin from the moment the fixation has already become a lock, not from the moment it was a locally successful passage.

What is first fixed is not merely the substance or the behavior, but the entire relation:

- **this thing relieves now,**
- **this thing returns me to a minimum of bearability,**
- **this thing opens the door of passage when other doors close.**

Thus a first reference point is formed: a fixed difference telling the carrier—implicitly or explicitly—that this axis succeeds where other axes fail.

Lock of the section:
Addiction often begins not from love of the thing, but from a local success in passage that made the thing worthy of repeated fixation.

F.4 The Economy of Measurement: From Plurality to Contraction
Once this fixation succeeds repeatedly, the economy of measurement begins to reshape the field. In a balanced condition (**E2**), the carrier can measure through multiple axes:

- distant effect,
- health,
- reputation,
- relationship,
- future cost,

- and general meaning.

But under the pressure of tension, pain, anxiety, or emptiness, capacity contracts and economy intensifies. Here the transition begins:

- from **E2/E1** to **E3/E4**,
- from multi-axial reading to almost single-axis reading,
- from **What ought to be done?** to **What relieves now?**

This is not mere weakness, but an economic shift within measurement. In the acute economy, the world does not disappear, but is read through one reference that monopolizes passage:

- sedation,
- pleasure,
- immediate survival,
- or the avoidance of immediate collapse.

This explains why long-term advice seems ineffective in the moment of pressure: not necessarily because it is false, but because it operates through a reference that is no longer dominant in that moment. Knowledge exists, but the economy of measurement no longer grants it leadership.

Nor does this contraction occur in a purely psychological void; the carrier here is bodily as well. Pain, deprivation, sleep disturbance, hormonal tension, and withdrawal symptoms all press upon the frame from within and drive it toward **E4/E3**. In this sense, biology is not an alternative to operational analysis, but one of its material conditions: it does not by itself explain the meaning of the behavior, but it helps explain why near passage becomes more urgent and why distant alternatives grow cold in a given moment.

Key sentence:

Addiction is not merely an intensity of desire, but a contraction in the economy of measurement that makes the near reference stronger than every distant reference.

F.5 Identity: From "I Do This" to "I Am the One Who Cannot Pass Without It"

In the early stages, the behavior may remain relatively separate from identity:

- **I do this sometimes,**
- **I use it when needed,**
- **I can stop whenever I want.**

But the more passage is repeatedly achieved through the same axis, the more identity begins to be gradually reformulated. The matter is no longer just an act, but becomes a pattern in the definition of self:

- **I am always the anxious one,**
- **I am the one who needs this to calm down,**
- **I am the one who cannot work without it,**
- **I am the one who collapses if deprived of it.**

Here the behavior turns from an instrument into an operational identity. This explains why stopping is not merely experienced as abandoning a habit, but often as a threat to the self itself. When the behavior collapses, the carrier does not merely feel that he has lost something useful, but that he has lost a reference by which he reads himself.

From here emerges the lock of identity:

- every objection is understood as an attack,
- every call to revision is read as a denial of suffering,
- every alternative seems strange, cold, or unreal.

Lock of the section:

In addiction, identity does not remain outside the behavior; each feeds on the other until the thing becomes a reference for reading the self, not merely an object of desire.

F.6 Time: Contraction of Horizon and the Sovereignty of the Present

Time in MARP is an ordering of resumption, not an independent substance. Addiction makes this especially visible: the future and the past do not disappear, but they lose the power of passage before the pressing present.

In a balanced condition, the carrier can connect:

- the present act,
- with the memory of its harms,
- with its coming consequences,
- with the image of himself tomorrow,
- and with his continuing relationships.

But in an acute economy, all this contracts into a narrow window:

- **now there is pain,**
- **now tension intensifies,**
- **now relief is demanded,**
- **now one must get through.**

From here, statements such as:

- **I'll stop tomorrow,**
- **This is the last time,**
- **When I rest, I will reorganize,**

are not necessarily conscious lies, but often expressions of a contracted temporality: a present devouring the horizon. The future remains conceptually available, but loses the power to compete with the present.

This also explains the contradiction between sincerity in the moment of remorse and relapse in the moment of pressure. The problem is not only in will, but in the fact that temporal reference itself has been reorganized: the time of pain is not the time of remorse, and the time of long-range decision is not the time of near passage.

Key sentence:
Addiction does not only hijack desire; it hijacks time. It makes the present an almost absolute reference, and cools the horizon until it appears to have no real force.

F.7 Memory: Preserved Information, but Cold
It is easy to think that the problem in addiction is forgetting the harm. But the matter is deeper. Very often, the harm is known, preserved, mentioned, and perhaps sincerely admitted. Yet it still does not work.

Here MARP helps us distinguish between:

- a preserved trace,
- and an effective trace.

Memory is not a box in which information is stored, but an economic preservation of what is necessary for resumption. In addiction, cognitive memory may remain present:

- the person knows what happened before,
- remembers the loss,
- knows the pain,
- and may even remember his promises.

But this trace does not enter the frame of decision with sufficient force. It becomes **cold information**:

- preserved,
- but without present power of passage,

while the addictive object carries a **live, charged trace**:

- pleasure,
- sedation,
- or a rapid promise of survival.

Information is cold when it remains reportable and retrievable, yet does not reorganize decision in the moment of pressure, nor compete with the actually dominant reference. A live datum, by contrast, is what can enter the frame of decision itself, redistributing time, alternatives, and cost.

Thus the real question is not **Does he remember?** but:

Which memory has the force of passage now?
The memory of harm, or the memory of relief?

Lock of the section:
The problem is not always loss of memory, but the difference in the temperature of traces: what remains alive in the frame, and what remains cold outside it.

F.8 Causality: From Explanation to Maintenance
Once fixation takes root, simplified causality begins to appear:

- **I am anxious, so I need it.**
- **I am tired, so I deserve it.**

- **I cannot sleep without it.**
- **Anyone would do the same in my place.**
- **The problem is not in it, but in the circumstances.**

These forms are not merely lies in the naïve moral sense, but often forms of interpretive maintenance. That is, they are causal links helping the fixation remain alive within the frame, even if they raise the cost later.

Here appears the difference between:

- a legitimate causality that accepts modification when the frame widens,
- and a causal lock that protects itself through added exceptions and justifications.

If the carrier says:

- **I do this because I am anxious,**

and it then becomes clear that the behavior itself has become a generator of new anxieties, or that anxiety is not always the carrying condition, then causality should be upgraded. If upgrading is refused, and every objection is met by a new cause or added justification, then we are before a lock.

Key sentence:
In addiction, the causal narrative may begin as a local explanation, then turn into a maintenance structure preventing the recognition that the thing itself has become part of reproducing the crisis.

F.9 Truth and Error: Does He "Really Know"?
In shallow moral discussion, it is often said: **He knows the truth, but refuses it.** MARP pushes the question into a more precise form:

What kind of knowledge exists here?

And is it a knowledge that possesses passage?

Or merely preserved information outside the frame of decision?

Truth in MARP is not mere correspondence, but a legitimate fixation:

- it passes,
- it stabilizes,
- and it accepts revision.

From this perspective, we may say:
the carrier may possess cold knowledge that is true in formulation, yet not possess a living operational truth capable of organizing decision under pressure.

In other words:
it is not enough that he says, **This harms me.**
That statement must enter the network of attribution such that it:

- competes with desire,
- redistributes time,
- reconstructs causality,
- and protects identity from lock.

Lock of the section:
Addiction shows that verbal truth is not enough; truth becomes effective only when it enters the frame of passage itself.

F.10 Consciousness: Why Is "Knowledge" Alone Not Enough?

Consciousness in MARP is an advanced measurement bringing the differences of the carrier itself into operation. This helps us understand why it is not enough in addiction

that the person be aware. Knowledge may be present, yet consciousness fails in the moment of pressure to bring into one coherent reading:

- bias,
- tension,
- temporal contraction,
- reference capture,
- the presence of the holding environment,
- and the criterion of decision itself.

In moments of calm, consciousness may succeed to a higher degree:

- it admits,
- analyzes,
- understands,
- and sees the dissonance.

But in the moment of pressure, economy drops, and measurement falls from **E2/E1** to **E3/E4**. The question then is not **Has consciousness disappeared?** but: **Has it managed to preserve referential plurality?**

Key sentence:
Consciousness does not necessarily vanish in addiction, but it is often compressed until it loses the capacity to manage multiple differences, and reference returns to one highly penetrating axis.

F.11 A Brief Dialogue with Medicine and Psychology

This analysis does not cancel medical, psychological, or social approaches, nor does it claim that MARP replaces them. More precisely, MARP adds an organizational interpretive layer binding them within one language.

Medicine may describe addiction as:

- a chronic disorder,
- a dysfunction in reward circuits,
- a change in dopamine sensitivity,
- or a reshaping of neural pathways.

Psychology may read it as:

- a disorder of emotional regulation,
- a response to trauma,
- a pattern of coping with pain,
- or a failure in impulse control.

The social approach may connect it to:

- poverty,
- marginalization,
- family disintegration,
- or fragility of the holding environment.

MARP does not compete with these approaches in their proper subject matter; it provides a language linking them together:

- what medicine calls **changes in neural circuitry** can here be read as a material basis for the contraction of the economy of measurement and the stabilization of near passage;
- what psychology calls **failure in emotional regulation** can be read as a disturbance in the distribution of reference under pressure;

- what the social approach calls **environmental fragility** can be read as weakness of the holding environment and poverty of alternatives capable of carrying resumption.

Lock of the section:

MARP does not abolish medicine, psychology, or sociology; it offers a language linking neural structure, lived experience, and the social holding environment within one logic: who possesses passage, at what cost, and within what domain of legitimacy?

F.12 A Brief Comparative Table

Dimension	Before Addictive Contraction	During Addictive Contraction	During Reconstruction
Economy of measurement	E2/E1 multi-axial	E4/E3 contracted around one axis	Gradual return to E2
Identity	Flexible and multi-entry	Centered around the thing or the soothing	Flexible, being rebuilt
Time	Relatively open horizon	Dominant present and cold horizon	Reorganized horizon

Memory	Harm and benefit together in decision	Knowledge preserved but cold	Harmful meaning returns as live
Causality	Open explanation, revisable	Maintenance, justification, narrative monopoly	More balanced explanation, less maintenance
Consciousness	Better capacity for referential plurality	Fall into threshold or template reading	Recovery of criterion-examination
Holding environment	Support, regulation, possible alternatives	Eroded trust and high maintenance	Recovery of network and its limits
Meaning	Distributed across multiple axes	Reduced to the gain of near passage	Broader meaning of continuation

Lock of the table:

This table does not present a rigid law, but a map of transition helping us see that addiction is not merely an extra act, but a comprehensive reorganization of attribution.

F.13 Meaning and Ethics: From Individual Continuation to the Holding Environment

In the later stages, addiction no longer remains merely a struggle between a person and a thing; it enters a network of:

- promise,
- trust,
- justice,
- responsibility,
- reputation,
- and the holding environment.

Here addiction meets Chapter Ten of MARP directly:

- meaning narrows into the gain of near passage,
- and ethics becomes strained because the protocol of shared resumption begins to collapse.

The carrier does not merely break an individual decision, but may draw the whole holding environment into maintenance:

- lying,
- justification,
- loss of trust,
- constant repair,
- and mutual fear.

Not every holding environment is protective. The holding environment may be:

- supportive of resumption,
- complicit with the lock,

- or punitive to a degree that raises maintenance and returns the carrier to the addictive reference.

For this reason, the value of the holding environment is not measured merely by its existence, but by the kind of passage it allows: does it open alternatives, or reproduce the hijacking?

If the carrier no longer finds meaning for continuation except in the gain of near passage, then every ethical discourse seems distant, cold, and imposed from above. If a broader meaning can be rebuilt—not in a merely sermonizing way, but operationally—then reference begins to widen again.

Lock of the section:
Addiction is not only a crisis of desire, but a crisis of meaning and ethics together: it contracts continuation into near soothing, and makes the holding environment pay the cost of maintaining it.

F.14 Relapse: Not Merely a Moral Failure, but a Structural Revelation
Relapse is one of the richest sites for understanding addiction within MARP, because it reveals whether reconstruction has reached the frame of decision itself, or remained suspended above it.

The carrier may understand the harm, formulate a clear plan, and show genuine sincerity in wanting to stop, then relapse. The most precise explanation here is not always:

- **He was not serious,**
- or **His will is weak,**

but rather:

- Was the monopoly of reference actually broken?

- Was an operational competitor built that possessed near passage?
- Did knowledge remain cold?
- Did time collapse again?
- Did the holding environment remain fragile or punitive instead of carrying resumption?

In other words, relapse often reveals that some structural element remained unreorganized. Perhaps behavior changed outwardly, but:

- the nearest reference remained the same,
- or the alternative lacked sufficient warmth,
- or external pressure returned the economy to **E4/E3**,
- or the carrier could not transfer the upgrade into the actual moment of decision.

This does not mean that every relapse is explained in the same way. It means that MARP can read relapse not merely as a contradiction between a sincere intention and a false behavior, but as the place where the limits of upgrading, the limits of the holding environment, and the limits of economy become visible.

Key sentence:
Relapse does not only reveal that stopping failed; it reveals where reference remained hijacked, and where the alternative did not become a living route of passage.

F.15 Reconstruction: From Lock to the Redistribution of Reference

From within MARP, recovery from addiction is not merely cessation or abstinence, but a re-engineering of resumption. This means that the solution does not lie primarily in blaming the carrier or glorifying bare will, but in rebuilding a frame in which multi-axial measurement can again become possible.

This does not mean that reconstruction is always equally possible, nor that every restoration of reference succeeds finally. It means that recovery is not understood here as a merely moral abstention, but as a reorganization that may partially succeed, or falter, or relapse depending on the carrier, the holding environment, and the pressure.

This can be summarized in five movements:

1) Breaking the monopoly of reference

The addictive object must cease to be the sole reference for passage. So long as it remains the most effective axis of soothing or crossing, all other axes will remain cold.

2) Building a near operational competitor

It is not enough to tell the carrier, **This harms you.** Something else must be built that possesses near passage:

- a relationship,
- a ritual,
- a meaning,
- an alternative,
- an organization,
- or communal presence.

3) Turning knowledge from cold information into a live datum

That is, bringing it into the daily system of decision instead of leaving it as a distant slogan.

4) Re-expanding time

So that the present no longer remains the sole absolute ruler, but the future regains real weight within decision.

5) Restoring the holding environment

Because resumption is not always rebuilt inside an isolated individual; sometimes it needs a network that redistributes reference:

- recognition,
- boundaries,
- support,
- and a space for upgrading identity without humiliation.

Key sentence:

Recovery from addiction is not only the stopping of something, but the rebuilding of the conditions of passage so that the destructive thing is no longer the shortest route to resumption.

F.16 Final Lock

If this entire application is to be reduced to one sentence, it is this:

Addiction in MARP is neither an evil essence nor a purely moral weakness, but a hijacking of reference and a contraction of the economy of measurement, such that the gain of near passage becomes the monopolistic center of identity, decision, time, and causality, while knowledge remains cold unless resumption is re-engineered anew.

Here the practical value of the framework appears:

- it does not compete with medicine in its subject matter,
- nor with psychology in its tools,
- nor with ethics in its discourse,
- but provides a unified language for understanding:
    - how fixation begins,
    - how it turns into a lock,

- how maintenance rises,
- and how revisability may be restored.

Final lock:

What addiction finally reveals is that a person does not fall only because the thing is strong, but because reference has narrowed until passage became possible through one door alone. Recovery begins not merely when that door is hated, but when other doors—passable, less costly, and more sustainable—are reopened.

Appendix (G)

Extended Application: Quantum Measurement as the Fixation of Reference, Not an Ontological Riddle

G.0 Introduction: Why Is Quantum Theory a Decisive Example for MARP?

If Appendix (F) revealed how MARP works within the individual carrier in the phenomenon of addiction, then quantum measurement reveals how the framework works in an entirely different field—one in which philosophy is usually asked to intervene in order to explain what seems strange or contrary to intuition.

The importance of this example lies in the fact that quantum mechanics embarrasses us not only with its results, but with the very way it frames its questions:

- What happens before measurement?
- Is the result already there, or does it appear?
- Who determines it?
- Is the observer required?
- Are probabilities real things in the world?
- Is the collapse of the wave function an ontological event, or merely an update in knowledge?

In all these questions, a recurring philosophical danger appears: the confusion of mathematical-operational description with final ontological description. Here MARP does not come to offer an alternative physical interpretation, but to reorder the place of the question itself: what happens when a frame of measurement is fixed within attribution, so that the fluidity of differences becomes a record fit for resumption?

Key sentence:

In this appendix, quantum theory is not treated merely as a field for proving the strangeness of the world, but as a highly sensitive site in which the limits of reference, the conditions of fixation, and the criterion of legitimacy within attribution appear with unusual clarity.

G.1 A Brief Historical Entry: Einstein and Bohr as Two Different Demands

The reader may enter the quantum problem through a famous intellectual scene. On one side, Niels Bohr tended to say that physics does not speak about what the world is in itself, but about what can be said legitimately under the conditions of measurement. On the other side, Albert Einstein pressed in the opposite direction: a successful description of experiment is not enough unless it also grants us a stronger picture of what is really there.

If we read this disagreement in the language of MARP, we may say:

- Bohr comes close to emphasizing the limits of attribution, even if he does not use that term;
- Einstein demands a stronger realism, that is, a description going beyond operational legitimacy toward something closer to the Absolute.

This does not mean that one of them is MARPian and the other anti-MARP. It means rather that the famous disagreement itself can be understood as a disagreement over the place of the question:

Is the frame of measurement and the stability it produces enough?
Or must physics go beyond that to a stronger ontological structure?

Here the usefulness of MARP appears: it does not lightly dismiss either demand, but reorders the relation between them. Operational success is not an illusion, but neither does it automatically become a final description of the Absolute.

Lock of the section:

The great quantum disagreement begins not from experiment alone, but from a difference in what is being asked of scientific language in the first place: is it a legitimate description within attribution, or a final image of reality in itself?

G.2 What Exactly Needs Explanation?

To prevent discussion of quantum theory from becoming an accumulation of terms, we should first specify what needs to be explained. There are six central features that make quantum measurement a philosophical problem:

- the mathematical formulation allows a description that seems to involve multiple possible outcomes before measurement;
- the announced result in experiment comes out singular and determinate;
- the introduction of a measuring device or recording frame changes what appears;
- talk of the observer is often confused with talk of consciousness;
- quantum interpretations proliferate even though they begin from a closely similar experimental structure;
- and the success of the physics is extremely high, yet the philosophical dispute does not disappear.

These points are not adequately explained if we merely say:

- The world is strange,
- or The mathematics works, and that is enough,
- or The observer creates truth,

- or Everything exists in all states at once.

Each of these formulas grasps one side, then tends to turn it into a final image. MARP instead asks a more precise question: what follows from fixing a frame of measurement that produces a preserved trace, and how does this fixation reorganize what may be said legitimately about the state?

G.3 Correcting the Place of the Question: Where Does the Confusion Begin?

In many quantum discussions, confusion begins when we treat the mathematical state as though it were a transparent image of what exists in the Absolute, then become astonished when we cannot read the world directly from it. Here we must restore the basic distinction of MARP:

- the Absolute is not an object of measurement, nor a field of ready-made objects for counting;
- attribution is the level at which differences become readable through a determinate frame.

If we carry this distinction into quantum theory, we may say: what the mathematical formulation provides is not a final window into the Absolute, but an operational identity of what can be expected under a specified frame of measurement. The shape of the question then changes from:

What really exists before measurement?

to:

What does the current frame of measurement allow us to fix as a legitimate operational identity fit for resumption?

This shift does not abolish the question. It returns it from the level of the Absolute to the level of attribution, where it can be examined legitimately.

Lock of the section:

The root problem is not that the world is contrary to reason, but that operational language is being asked to do the work of final ontological language.

G.3.1 Related Clarification: Against the View from Nowhere in Quantum Interpretation

One recurring temptation in the philosophy of quantum theory is to ask for a description of the system as it is in itself, wholly apart from any frame of measurement. This temptation appears stronger in quantum mechanics because the role of measurement is unusually explicit. Yet the demand itself remains illegitimate in MARP. It asks operational language to deliver what no operational language can provide: a final view of reality from outside every act of attribution.

The problem may be stated in a more precise form. Readable difference requires attribution. No measurement occurs in a vacuum, and no difference becomes scientifically meaningful unless it is fixed relative to a frame, a reference, and a record fit for return and comparison. For that reason, the wish to describe the quantum system as though one could stand outside every measuring relation is not a deeper realism; it is the demand for a view from nowhere.

MARP rejects this demand without collapsing into skepticism. It does not conclude that reality is arbitrary, nor that measurement creates the world out of nothing. It concludes only that what science legitimately secures is an operational identity of the system under determinate conditions of fixation. Once this is understood, quantum measurement no longer appears as a magical intrusion into an otherwise hidden ontology. It appears instead as a particularly sharp case of a general rule: no determinate attribution without a frame, no scientific resumption without a record.

This also clarifies the role of the observer. The observer is not a transcendent consciousness standing over reality. Nor is the observer a metaphysical power that

grants existence to what was previously unreal. What matters is the production of a preserved trace within a determinate measuring structure. The observer, whether human or instrumental, belongs to the network of attribution through which such trace becomes available for resumption.

Key sentence:

Quantum theory does not show that the world defeats reason; it shows that reason often asks more of the language of measurement than that language can legitimately provide.

Lock of the clarification:

The view from nowhere is not denied because MARP fears realism, but because no frame of measurement can legitimately step outside the conditions that make readable difference possible in the first place.

G.4 The Quantum State: An Operational Identity, Not a Final Picture

In MARP, the state is read not as the essence of the thing, but as a referential fixation defining what can be expected within the structure of measurement. This is especially important in quantum theory, because much of the confusion comes from loading the state with more than it can bear.

When we say that the system is in a given state, we are not necessarily reporting its absolute nature. Rather, we are fixing an operational description that succeeds in:

- organizing expectation,
- linking measurements,
- preserving stability across copies,
- and opening the door to revision when the frame changes.

In this sense, the quantum state resembles what the main text called operational identity:

- it is not mere subjective ignorance,
- nor is it a completed essence,
- but a description that works within its domain of legitimacy.

This is why changing the frame is not secondary: the operational identity itself is tied to what is measured, how it is measured, and by what record the trace is preserved.

Key sentence:
The state in quantum theory is not the final truth of the system, but a legitimate descriptive structure so long as the frame that generated it remains the active one.

G.5 Measurement: The Fixing of Reference and the Production of a Record
In MARP, measurement is neither mere looking nor a magical event; it is the fixing of a frame that produces a record. The record here is what makes the result fit for return, comparison, and resumption:

- a reading on a screen,
- an effect in a device,
- a preserved change in an experimental path,
- or a difference referable to a recording structure.

The question therefore is no longer:

Was a human consciousness present?
but rather:
Was a carrying difference fixed within a record that can function as a later reference?

Here the observer can be re-understood: what is required is not a conscious essence imposing the result, but the formation of a recording frame that changes what may be said about the state, because it has inserted a new trace into the network.

This fits the heart of MARP:

- no reading without attribution,
- no attribution without a frame,
- no resumption without a preserved trace.

Lock of the section:
Quantum measurement is not the creation of reality out of nothing, but the insertion of a difference into a record that makes the previous operational identity insufficient on its own.

G.6 The Double-Slit Experiment: From Fluid Differences to Different Fixations
The double-slit experiment is an excellent example because much of the obscurity surrounding it results from confusing:

- a change in the world at the level of the Absolute,
- with a change in the frame of measurement within attribution.

When no frame fixing which slit is established, the system operates within a structure of differences that allows an interference pattern stable across copies. Here the absence of local determination is not a deficiency in the world, but part of the operational identity through which the experiment is functioning under its current reference.

But when a device or structure is added that makes which slit into a preserved, recordable difference, the frame changes, and with it the operational identity itself changes:

- we are no longer in the same domain,
- and the same differences are no longer integrated in the same way.

It is therefore unsurprising that a different pattern appears.

From this perspective we do not say:

- The world was fluctuating, then was suddenly decided.

We say instead:

- the prior domain of legitimacy integrated differences in a certain way,
- and the entry of a new record redistributed the carrying differences, so that it is no longer legitimate to treat the state as though this fixation had not occurred.

Key sentence:
The double-slit experiment does not prove the existence of a world between states so much as it reveals that changing the frame changes what passes legitimately as an operational identity.

G.7 Collapse: An Update of Identity, Not a Magical Act
What most provokes philosophical unease in quantum mechanics is the word collapse, because it suggests a sharp ontological event:

- something was in one condition,
- then a strange intervention occurred,
- and reality itself changed.

In MARP there is no need to load the word with all this weight. Collapse can be understood as an update of operational identity when a new frame enters the system through a preserved record.

That is, what collapses is not the world in the Absolute, but the legitimacy of the prior description as being sufficient on its own. After fixation, one can no longer continue with the old reading without maintenance or without ignoring the new record.

This is similar to what happens in non-quantum examples as well:

- a provisional diagnosis succeeds temporarily, then loses legitimacy after a new test;
- or a navigation route is correct before a closure appears, then insisting on it becomes a lock.

In this sense, collapse is not magic, but a recalibration of the limits of legitimacy after the addition of a new trace that cannot be ignored.

Lock of the section:
Collapse in MARP is not a moment of ontological creation or erasure, but a moment when a prior description loses its full legitimacy after a new record enters attribution.

G.8 Why Does It Seem to Us That Consciousness Is Necessary?
Even after saying that a device or recording structure is operationally enough, many readers—and some philosophers—still feel that consciousness must play a special role. Why?

That feeling itself can be read within MARP. Human beings are accustomed to treating valid registration in daily experience as something that usually passes through:

- present awareness,
- personal perception,
- and a felt witness that something has happened.

For that reason, the mind easily treats incomplete or non-conscious registration as though it were not yet complete. But this intuition issues from a familiar human frame, not from a general ontological necessity.

In other words, we easily confuse:

- registration as it becomes complete for us,
- with registration as a preserved trace fit for resumption within a system of measurement.

From here the attraction of consciousness can be understood:

- not because it is necessary evidence of ontological collapse,
- but because it is the most familiar form, for us, of a completed record.

This does not prevent consciousness from becoming important at another level:

- in interpretation,
- or report,
- or a theory of experience,

but it no longer remains a primary condition for saying that a difference has entered a record fit for resumption.

Lock of the section:

The attraction of consciousness in quantum theory does not necessarily reveal a special ontological role for it; it reveals rather that the familiar human form of registration is being projected onto every possible measuring structure.

G.9 Indeterminacy: The Hesitation of the Frame, Not of the Absolute

The main text established that probability is not a basket of options in the Absolute, but a

name for underdetermination within a limited frame. This becomes especially clear in the quantum context.

When we say:

- This result or that may appear,

we are not describing a world that hesitates between self-subsisting alternatives. We are describing a frame that does not yet possess enough determination, prior to fixation, to specify a singular result within a determinate record.

This does not mean that probability is an illusion. It means it is operational:

- it has a function in expectation,
- it measures the degree of disclosure within attribution,
- but it does not automatically become a list of actually existing things in the Absolute.

Here the value of MARP appears in avoiding two extremes:

- the view that turns probabilities into ready-made ontological entities,
- and the opposite view that denies their operational function and reduces them to merely verbal ignorance.

Quantum indeterminacy, then, is not read as chaos in being, but as a gap of determination within a limited frame before fixation is complete.

Key sentence:
Probability does not describe the hesitation of the world, but the degree of hesitation of the frame before measurement produces a record that forces redetermination.

G.10 Entanglement: A Shared Operational Identity, Not a Magical Message

Entanglement is one of the most controversial places in the philosophy of quantum theory, because in a quick reading it seems to imply an instantaneous relation surpassing all our usual means of causal understanding.

From within MARP, a more disciplined reading can be formulated: entanglement need not be understood as a magical message passing in the Absolute, but as a condition of shared operational identity within one frame. What is measured here is not each part as an entirely independent object from the start, but a relational structure entering fixation itself.

When a carrying difference is fixed at one end, this need not mean that something was sent in the Absolute in the usual imagined sense. It means that the domain of legitimacy previously describing the shared structure has now become newly determined. What changes at the other end is not its absolute reality, but what may be said legitimately within the same attribution about the linked structure.

In this sense, entanglement can be understood as:

- a shared frame
- for an operational identity irreducible in a simple way to the sum of two fully separate identities.

A local update at one side therefore redetermines the legitimacy of description at the other side within the same field, without forcing us to invoke mysterious instantaneous action in the Absolute.

This reading does not solve every problem of entanglement, but it blocks two common leaps:

- the leap from operational correlation to the myth of mysterious immediate action,
- and the reverse leap that denies the strangeness of the phenomenon altogether.

Lock of the section:

Entanglement in MARP is read as a structure of shared operational identity, such that every local fixation redetermines what may be legitimately carried about the whole structure within the same frame.

G.11 The Major Interpretations: A Criterion of Legitimacy Instead of Final Resolution

Quantum interpretations multiply because the transition from mathematical structure to a picture of the world is not one single necessary path. Here MARP offers an important criterion. We do not first ask:

Which interpretation possesses the absolute truth?
but rather:

- Which interpretation reduces interpretive maintenance?
- Which widens the domain of legitimacy?
- Which accepts upgrading?
- Which refrains from adding entities or assumptions not forced by scientific passage itself?

By this criterion, all interpretations can be read as different attempts to close the gap between:

- mathematical expectation,
- and the ontological identity of the world.

One interpretation may succeed in:

- reducing verbal obscurity,

- while raising ontological cost.

Another may succeed in:

- economy of entities,
- while leaving many questions suspended.

A third may provide comfort to the carrier by saying the question itself is meaningless, but may narrow the domain of legitimacy more than necessary.

MARP therefore does not impose one interpretation as the final solution, but offers a more precise way to distinguish between:

- a living interpretation,
- a locking interpretation,
- interpretive comfort,
- and legitimate upgrading.

Lock of the section:
In quantum theory, MARP does not demand an absolute metaphysical settlement; it demands that each interpretation declare its cost, its domain, its degree of maintenance, and its upgradeability.

G.12 Objectivity and Agreement Between Observers
One may say: if everything depends on a frame, then how do we explain the extensive agreement between observers and measurements in physics? Does this not prove that we have escaped attribution into an absolute truth?

MARP answers that shared objectivity does not require final correspondence in order to work. What is needed is:

- shared constraints,
- shared protocols of regulation,
- records open to revision,
- and an overlapping domain of legitimacy.

When observers share:

- a device,
- or a protocol,
- or a calibration,
- or a repeatable interpretive structure,

the identity of the phenomenon stabilizes within that shared domain.

Agreement is therefore not an escape from attribution, but a higher success of attribution:

- regulated attribution,
- repeatable attribution,
- shared attribution,
- attribution with little maintenance.

This fits MARP's idea of a surrogate of objectivity:

- objectivity is not transcendent correspondence,
- but stability across copies,
- a shareable criterion,
- and possible public correction.

Key sentence:

Agreement between observers does not reveal the abolition of attribution; it reveals the

construction of a more disciplined shared domain of legitimacy, more resistant to maintenance.

G.13 This Analysis and Physics: What Does MARP Add?

At times this analysis may seem to look down on physics from above. For that reason, its place must be fixed precisely. This appendix does not claim that physicists themselves speak the language of MARP, nor that it offers a substitute for their equations or experiments. It does something else: it offers a philosophical framework for understanding what scientists do when they measure, describe, and interpret.

That is, MARP does not replace physics, but reorders three levels that are often confused:

- **Experimental success:** What succeeds in prediction and control?
- **Operational description:** What identity do we fix within a determinate frame of measurement?
- **Ontological demand:** What do we want to add at the level of a picture of the world?

When these levels are confused, many illusions arise:

- either experimental success is taken to have given us a final image of the Absolute,
- or whatever does not become a final image is treated as lacking value.

MARP separates them:

- preserving the full success of physics within attribution,
- preventing that success from being automatically transformed into final metaphysics,
- and at the same time preventing it from being belittled as mere description.

Lock of the section:

MARP does not explain quantum theory instead of physics; it explains how to read the meaning of the success of physics and the limits of what that success permits within attribution.

G.14 A Brief Comparative Table

Quantum Concept	Common Reading (Site of the Problem)	Reading in MARP
State	A picture of reality in itself	An operational identity for expectation within a determinate frame
Measurement	A strange intervention creating the result	A fixation of reference producing a record fit for resumption
Collapse	A magical ontological event	An update in the legitimacy of the description after a new record enters
Probability	The world hesitating between options	Underdetermination within the frame before fixation
Observer	Human consciousness settling the hesitation	A recording structure inserting a preserved trace into attribution

Entanglement	A mysterious linkage or instantaneous action	A shared operational identity within one frame
Objectivity	Final correspondence to independent reality	Shared stability across copies and revisable protocols
Interpretations	A struggle over absolute truth	A comparison of maintenance cost, breadth of domain, and upgradeability

Lock of the table:

This table does not reduce the quantum dispute, but quickly shows where MARP intervenes: not to settle physics, but to reorder the language of the question.

G.15 What This Application Does Not Claim

So that this appendix is not misunderstood, four clear limits should be fixed.

First:

MARP does not claim to present a new physical theory competing with quantum mechanics or altering its equations.

Second:

It does not claim to settle finally among all quantum interpretations, nor to close the philosophical dispute around them.

Third:

It does not make the observer into a conscious essence above the world; but neither does

it reduce the meaning of measurement to mere human utterance. It ties measurement to a recording structure and a frame of resumption.

Fourth:

It does not equate operational description with ontological description. It places a methodological limit between them:

- operational description is understood within attribution,
- while the Absolute is not treated as an object of measurement or a storehouse of ready-made images.

Lock of the section:

What MARP offers here is not a solution to the quantum riddle in any final sense, but a purification of the place of the riddle: where legitimate questioning begins, and where projection begins.

G.16 Final Lock

If this whole application is to be reduced to one sentence, it is this:

Quantum measurement in MARP is neither a window onto a final essence of the world, nor a magical act creating truth from nothing, but the fixation of a frame that produces a record fit for resumption; after that, the operational identity of the system is reformulated according to what the new reference permits.

From this, the value of the framework becomes clear:

- it does not dissolve scientific success into relativism,
- nor burden it with more metaphysics than it can bear,
- but offers a unified language for understanding:
    - the state,

- measurement,
- collapse,
- probability,
- the observer,
- entanglement,
- interpretation,
- and objectivity,

as all being matters concerning the legitimacy of fixation within attribution.

Final lock:

What quantum theory finally reveals is not that the world defies reason, but that reason often asks more of the language of measurement than it was made to give. Once that language is returned to its proper place, wonder does not vanish entirely, but it loses its false form: it is no longer a riddle caused by a lack of magic, but a matter of limits, references, records, and resumption.

Selected References

Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Translated by C. D. C. Reeve. Hackett Publishing, 2016.

Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy: With Selections from the Objections and Replies*. Edited by John Cottingham. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Harper Perennial Modern Thought, 2008.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Oxford University Press, 1978.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logical Investigations*. 2 vols. Edited by Dermot Moran. Routledge, 2001.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Edited by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Kripke, Saul A. *Naming and Necessity*. Blackwell, 1981.

Leibniz, G. W. *Philosophical Essays*. Edited and translated by Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber. Hackett Publishing, 1989.

Lewis, David. *On the Plurality of Worlds*. Basil Blackwell, 1986.

McTaggart, J. M. E. "The Unreality of Time." *Mind* 17, no. 4 (1908): 457–474.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Donald A. Landes. Routledge, 2010.

Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press, 1986.

Quine, W. V. O. *Word and Object*. The MIT Press, 1960.

Sellars, Wilfrid. "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind." In *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 1, 253–329. Harvard University Press, 1956.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. 4th ed. Edited by P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.